THE EARLY TRACTARIANS AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

SHAW

THE EARLY TRACTARIANS AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

The Early Tractarians and The Eastern Church

BY
P. E. SHAW
Associate Professor of Church History
Hartford Theological Seminary

WITH FOREWORD BY
REV. LEIGHTON PULLAN, D.D.
Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford
University Lecturer in Church History

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
MILWAUKEE
A. R. MOWBRAY & CO.
LONDON

LIBRARY OF
Nashotah Theological Seminary
283
S53
23142

COPYRIGHT BY
MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
1930

CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Chapter	
I. Introductory	1
II. Tractarian Theory and the Eastern Church	7
Appendix A	46
Appendix B	50
III. The Early Tractarians and Reunion	59
IV. The Jerusalem Bishopric	101
Appendix C	142
V. The Palmer Episode	150
VI. Conclusion	177
Bibliography	188
Index	197

FOREWORD

THE AUTHOR of this book has written it with the conviction (*i*) that in the present-day interest in Reunion everything that is related to the subject ought to be taken into account; (*ii*) that little or insufficient stress has been laid hitherto on the bearing of Tractarianism upon the modern approach to the East. The writer is gifted with sympathy and insight, and I heartily recommend this work as throwing light upon an important by-path of practical Church History.

LEIGHTON PULLAN, D.D.,
Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford,
University Lecturer in Church History.

OXFORD, 1929.

PREFACE

THE PRESENT WORK has been undertaken in the belief that the Oxford Movement, which was to some extent contemporary with the modern revival of interest in Eastern Christianity, has an important bearing on the question of Christian Reunion, and more particularly of Reunion with the Eastern Orthodox Church.

For valued counsel, criticism, and encouragement, the writer desires gratefully to acknowledge his special indebtedness to the Reverend Leighton Pullan, D.D., of St. John's College, Oxford, who has, moreover, written the Foreword to this work; and to Professor F. J. Foakes Jackson, D.D., of Union Theological Seminary, New York City, who also in the first instance suggested the line of research of which the present volume is the outcome.

OXFORD,
August, 1929.

Chapter I.

INTRODUCTORY

The consideration of the relations of Early Tractarianism to the Eastern Church is concerned with but one episode in an effort extending over nearly one hundred years. The modern phase of Anglo-Eastern intercourse may be divided into four periods: 1833 to 1845, the years of the Tractarian Revival; 1845 to 1870, which is concerned largely with Sub-Tractarian activities; 1870 to 1875, the period of the Bonn Conferences; 1875 to the present day. Of these it is the first that will receive attention in the following pages.

Timeliness of the Discussion

The theme is timely because of recent developments toward Reunion, and because of the peculiar circumstances of the Eastern Church today. Certain it is that the endeavours of Anglo-Saxon Christendom to end the divisions in the Christian Church are breaking down barriers, and are familiarizing the present generation of Christians with the idea and urgency of

Reunion. In these endeavours nothing is more noteworthy than the marked advance and definiteness in Anglican approaches to the East. And this work is becoming increasingly important and pressing because of the precarious position of the Eastern Communion, due to its many misfortunes of late years and to its uncertain prospects in the immediate future.

Again, any discussion of union with the Church of England should be welcome to the Churches of the East, since such union would powerfully assist them in fulfilling their peculiar mission, whether in uplifting their own people, or in evangelizing the non-Christian populations of Western Asia and Eastern Europe. It would lessen the danger, always present to some extent, of losses from Orthodoxy to Roman Catholicism.[1] It would also tend to hasten that Reformation in life and teaching which is believed by many leaders in the Orthodox world to be imperative and overdue. In the effort to secure a Reformation such as would avoid some of the extremes of Romanism and of Protestantism, association with the Church of England would be highly desirable;

[1] On the question of recent Roman Catholic efforts among the Eastern Churches see articles in *The Christian East,* July, 1921, page 127 f; October, 1922, pp. 97-99; March, 1923, pp. 141 f; May 1923, pp. 76-83.

for as Dean Hook early pointed out, the Church of England could be "taken as a model for a Reformation," and would be seen to illustrate in her own case how "a Church can be Reformed and yet Catholic." [2]

Range of the Subject

Any attempt to relate the story of Anglo-Eastern relations would have to face the criticism that the record which it professes to set forth is only of an exchange of courtesies and amicable sentiments, and therefore scarcely deserves the designation of "history." But such criticism involves both an unnecessary limiting of the term, and an incomplete appreciation of the nature of the subject. There is a history of ideas as well as of events, of efforts no less than of achievements. The exchange of courtesies referred to has had a definite end in view. And it has not been unfruitful in results, since it has been able to influence opinion within the two communions, to remove suspicion and lessen antagonisms, and to bring about an era of co-operation which is the precursor of Reunion.

But the process, because of its slowness or of its methods, has at times been felt to be exasperating. For on the one hand there have

[2] W. F. Hook, *Reasons for Contributing Towards the Support of an English Bishop at Jerusalem,* 1842, pp. 10 and 12.

been Anglican extremists who have either been wont to exhibit undue haste or have been too ready to make concessions in matters held to be vital by the Church they represented; and on the other hand there have been Orthodox irreconcilables, determined at all costs to insist on their own terms, and averse to any concession in the interests of unity.[3]

Now the historical investigations of Anglican and Eastern Relations would need to take account not only of actual overtures, but also of the temper exhibited on either side, of eccentricities or peculiarities of the leading individuals concerned, of any misdirection of effort, and of the intellectual and spiritual atmosphere of the time in so far as that was likely to affect the Reunion Movement. Moreover, it would have to indicate the mistakes in past negotiations, and to mark out more clearly the path for the future.

With regard to the limited period which is the subject of this essay, it will be found, in the first place, that the Early Tractarians, because of their special theological affirmations, laid the foundation for a true approach to the problem of Anglican and Eastern Relations. In the

[3] *Cp.:* A. C. Headlam, *The Christian East,* July, 1921, pp. 91-97, on "Union with the Orthodox Church." See esp. p. 95.

second place, it was natural that hopes should be expressed for Reunion with the East and some steps taken toward that end, seeing that the Tractarian "Theory of the Church" maintained that the three branches of Christendom were essentially one, and that absence of communion now was mainly due to misunderstandings which ought to be removed. Again, the Jerusalem Bishopric crisis compelled them to come from what was largely theoretic ground to the realm of the actual, and to define to themselves still more clearly their estimate of, and their attitude toward, the Eastern Church. And lastly, the persistent attempts of an individual to obtain in his own person recognition by the East of the Catholicity of the Church of England proved of permanent value, in that it began the modern thorough investigation of the nature and teaching of the Eastern Church.

Method of Treatment

Tractarianism in its beginnings synchronized with the renewal of approaches to the Eastern Church on the part of the Church of England, and later on became itself a promoter of such intercourse. The attitude therefore of the Tractarian leaders during those early years toward this movement deserves consideration. In undertaking this inquiry the general

method followed will be to examine the writings of the Early Tractarians themselves, and those of the Orthodox Church which were in existence at the time and with which the Tractarians may be presumed to have been familiar. Though the rule cannot be strictly adhered to, there will be an avoidance as far as possible of Sub-Tractarian writings, and of Orthodox works and pronouncements dating from a time later than the early years of the Oxford Movement.

Chapter II.

TRACTARIAN THEORY AND THE EASTERN CHURCH

The extensive changes brought about by the Tractarian Revival in the matter of modes of worship and types of piety tend to give countenance to the popular idea that the Oxford Movement was primarily a Reformation in the externals of religion. The fact, however, is that these changes were not the first objective of the Oxford leaders, but were rather the effect of certain fundamental beliefs. Throughout the study of Tractarianism, therefore, it is of the utmost importance to lay stress on the theoretical aspect of the movement.

Tractarianism was a theory, which worked itself out in a variety of ways; that is to say, in the direction both of doctrinal deductions and of ecclesiastical observances. But in the early stages of the movement there were differences as to the theory itself, and this because the persons who had adopted it were as yet feeling their way. It was as if they had stumbled upon

a startling discovery, the full import of which they could not be expected to appreciate all at once. A consistent and unanimous presentation of the theory was out of the question at the time, unless it were first proposed to set limits to the field of investigation and adventure. When William Palmer of Worcester College suggested that the *Tracts for the Times* should be issued, not as from individuals, but as representing the considered judgment of the entire body, Newman rightly protested, perceiving that it would be better to give each contributor free scope for original enquiry into the realms but lately opened out to those enthusiastic minds.[1] It was natural, therefore, that at that early stage Tractarians should exhibit differences, and even contradictions, on the present topic as on others. Nevertheless, in spite of some divergences, there is general agreement on the main subject of the Notes of the Christian Ecclesia, so that it is not incorrect to speak of "the Tractarian Theory of the Church."

[1] *Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During His Life in the English Church.* New edition, 1898. Vol. I, pp. 407-408: Letter to Keble, written between Aug. 5 and Nov. 5, 1833. *Ibid.*, pp. 409-412 (esp. page 410), Letter to W. Palmer, Oct. 24, 1833. William Palmer, of Worcester College, *Narrative of Events Connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on Existing Tendencies to Romanism and on the Present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church.* 1843. Chapter II. Also: Introduction to 1883 edition, Chapter VII.

I. Theological Basis of Tractarianism.

A theological content is to be found in the distinctive message of all permanent revivals of religion, and the Anglican Revival presents no exception to this rule. Its theological contribution was concerned with the social aspect of the Faith. Not in the Eucharist alone, but everywhere, the tendency was to discern the Body of Christ. The stress was on the corporate existence of Christians in accord with the revealed will of their Head. Hence, this was primarily a Movement for the *Church.* The subsequent appeals to the conscience of believers, to the ecclesiastical consciousness of the clergy, to the energies of the Christian Society, were all the outcome of the social message which had now been rediscovered. Whether the premises could be challenged or not is known to be a matter of opinion; but once accepted, the deductions that followed were natural, inevitable, irresistible.

The causes leading to the emergence of this particular emphasis had to do partly with religion in general, and partly with the position of the Church of England. Those were critical days for religion in England. There was peril from the rise of a new philosophy, from the appeal of intellectualism, from the prevalence

of liberalism whether in the speculative or in the political sphere. Even if these dangers were somewhat exaggerated, there could be no denying the fact of a decline in religious fervour, and of increasing neglect of spiritual ordinances. The Church was disintegrating and losing its power. Reverence and wonder were disappearing. And alongside all this there was a determined political attack on the Established Church.

The Church of England was in an anomalous position. Kept in power by the secular authority, the one thing of which she seemed certain was this species of Erastianism, a characteristic peculiar to herself.[2] But it was impossible to engage in the defence of the Church while she was not sure of herself as a spiritual agent and could not justify better her existence; for, in spite of some High Anglican traditions, the Church of England as a whole had no clear view regarding herself and her relation to the rest of Christendom.

Moreover, she was still under the controlling influence of the Protestant Reformation. Protestantism, however, was a revolt against a system, and a defence of the rights of

[2] Frederick Oakeley, *Explanation of a Passage in an Article on Certain Works on Bishop Jewel, Published in the "British Critic" for July 1841*, 1842, page 18.

the individual. This revolt led to extremes in individualism, and the reaction was bound to follow. Within the Anglican Church it did so in the Catholic Revival.

II. Source of the Theory.

The Oxford Movement was partly the result of the awakening of the historic sense in religion. The past was idealized and was appealed to for light on the problems of the present. The Church of the first centuries, of "her pure days and her Oecumenical Councils, and primitive faith and holiness," [3] commanded both affection and obedience. It was taken for granted that so long as the Catholic Church "was one, and spake one language, and could speak as one" she was guarded from error. But that Church of "those ages when truth must have been known" [4] was removed by centuries from the present time. It had to be sought in the period before the final rupture between East and West in 1054, and before 787, the date of the Second Nicene Council which the Anglican Church has ever been disposed to reject.

[3] E. B. Pusey, *Letter to Dr. Jelf on The Articles Treated on in Tract 90 Reconsidered, and Their Interpretation Vindicated.* 1841, page 185.

[4] Hugh James Rose, *State of Protestantism in Germany,* 2d edition, 1829, page 27.

This appeal to Antiquity involved the recognition of the value of Tradition, and of the authority of the Oecumenical Councils.

1. Tradition

Tradition was believed to be one of the three things necessary for the guidance of the Church, the other two being the Scriptures and the illumination of the Holy Spirit. That could be no true Church which was based on the Bible alone and gave no heed to the voice of Antiquity.[5] Pains were taken to show that Tradition had been recognized by the Anglican Church from the first, and had been honoured even by the Continental Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century.[6] This oral, extra-biblical teaching was identified with the "deposit" mentioned in II Timothy 1 : 14,[7] and it was understood to refer to ecclesiastical customs and order, and to interpretation of Scripture truths; all this having been made binding

[5] It will be noticed that no countenance is given to the "Bible-Religion" idea; thus showing a divergence from the general Protestant position. Keble, for instance, is too impatient with this to attempt to answer it. Writing of Chillingworth's dictum, *The Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Protestants,* he contents himself with remarking that it is not surprising the author, according to report, should have died an Arian or almost such. (Keble, *Primitive Tradition,* 1836, pp. 62-63, being Note H to page 40 of the Sermon.)

[6] *Cp.* Tract No. 78. Also, W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d edition, 1842. Part III.

[7] John Keble, *Primitive Tradition Recognized in Holy Scripture,* 1836, pages 14 f.

by decisions of Councils, or by being embodied in the Creeds of the Church.

For a similar reason are the great Councils considered authoritative. They are believed to set forth, on matters vital to the whole body of Christians, the final judgment of the One Church. They are the means whereby the decisions of undivided Christendom are formulated and made known. If Oral Tradition, handed down from the Oecumenical period, is entitled to respect and acceptance, much more would be the pronouncements of an assembly representing the entire body of the faithful, and expressly called for the purpose of defining doctrines concerning faith and morals to be held by the Universal Church.

2. The Oecumenical Councils

But the question arises whether such a Council is infallible, as is maintained alike by the Eastern Church and the Western. In this connection the Tractarians not only laid an emphasis, unfamiliar to contemporary Anglicanism, on Oecumenical Councils, but they also ascribed to them an importance at variance with the views then commonly held, which were based on Article XXI.[8] This Article had been

[8] Article of Religion, XXI ("Of the Authority of General Councils"), may here be given: "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes.

understood to admit the possibility of error even on the part of such Councils. But Newman, in Tract 90, sought to explain it by suggesting that the General Councils of which it speaks are not in every instance the Oecumenical, and that they are fallible except when, as in the case of the latter, there is a promise of supernatural protection against error.[9] This explanation commended itself to most of the Tractarians. Pusey, for instance, thinks that "there is ample scope for our Article in asserting that 'General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred,' without touching upon the Oecumenical." [10] And again he writes, "We believe that (although Councils which have been termed 'General,' or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred) no real Oecumenical Council ever did; that is, no Council really representing the Universal Church." [11] He confesses that he was led to this view by the statement in the Article that "General Coun-

---

And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men, whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God), they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of holy Scripture."

[9] J. H. Newman, Tract 90, Section 5.

[10] E. B. Pusey, *Letter to Dr. Jelf, on The Articles Treated on in Tract 90* . . . 1841, page 27.

[11] E. B. Pusey, *Letter to* . . . *the Bishop of Oxford* . . . 1839, p. 44.

cils . . . *sometimes* have erred," concluding thereby that sometimes they had not, and that those times were when the Councils were truly Oecumenical.[12]

It is not surprising that to non-Tractarians all this should have seemed an ingenious attempt to get round the meaning of the Article, assuming it did have any meaning at all, when the right course would have been boldly to reject the Article altogether. But dissatisfaction was not confined to those outside the movement. Newman's ardent follower, W. G. Ward, averse to anything suggesting evasion, was unable to follow his leader in this interpretation.[13] Notwithstanding such criticism, this exposition of the Article determined the place the Councils were to have in Tractarian theology, and gave them a peculiar eminence and authority in opposition to the Protestant doctrine of the Right of Private Judgment.

III. The Theory Itself.

The Tractarians proceeded on the assumption that from the first Christ intended to leave an organization on earth to represent Him and

[12] E. B. Pusey, *Introduction to Tract 90,* 1865. Preface, page v.

[13] For W. G. Ward's view of the Article see his *A Few Words in Support of No. 90* . . . 1841; and *A Few More Words in Support of No. 90 of the Tracts for the Times,* 1841.

to carry out His behests. Proof of this was found in the Matthean sayings;[14] and these naturally did not suggest to them the historical difficulties which modern criticism finds it impossible to overlook. That the "Ecclesia" was to be a distinct organization was taken for granted, and it was further believed that the existing Church was identical with the original, divinely-instituted Society.[15] That being admitted, it was natural to insist upon those elements as its characteristics which, according to the teaching and practice of antiquity, were essential marks of the Church. Now it was known that the Nicene Creed made belief in the Church one of the Articles of the Christian faith, and had given a description of that institution. No better statement was needed therefore of the Notes of the Church than that contained in the relevant clause of the Creed. The Church is "One, Holy, Catholic, Apostolic": all else is a matter of interpretation of these terms.

The Church was intended by Christ to be

---

[14] Mt. 16:18, 19. Mt. 18:15-20. For a careful treatment of the subject, and an answer to the more extreme modern critical position, *cp.* A. C. Headlam, Bampton Lectures, 1920: Lecture I, "The Origins of the Church."

[15] *E.g.,* W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, 3d ed., 1842, Part I, Chapter I, Section ii, "On the Perpetuity of the Church."

one, a visible undivided society,[16] and this condition prevailed during the first few centuries of the Christian era. But it does no longer exist. It ceased when East and West became permanently sundered. The "One vast body of Christians, called the Church, throughout the world . . . in every country where the name of Christ was named" [17] is not to be found. "That vast Catholic body, 'the Holy Church throughout all the world,' is broken into many fragments by the power of the Devil." [18]

1. Unity

To the Romanist this situation need present no difficulty, since for him the ideal is safeguarded by the expedient of identifying the Church in its entirety with the Roman Communion and denying the claim of Anglican or Eastern to belong to the body of Christ at all.[19] But

---

[16] *Cp.* relevant discussion by W. Palmer, in *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Part I, Chapters iii, iv, v.

[17] J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons,* Vol. 3, p. 207 (Sermon xiv, on "Submission to Church Authority"). 1836.

[18] *Ibid.,* p. 208. See also Vol. 5, page 196. (Sermon xii, on "The New Works of the Gospel".) 1840.

[19] *Cp.* E. B. Pusey, *Letter to Dr. Jelf,* 1841, p. 155: (Rome's) "simple theory: it removes all the difficulties which these sad and long rents of the Church present to other theories of her Unity, to say boldly with Rome, that the Church is visibly one still; that intercommunion is essential to the one visible Church; that Rome and Churches not in communion with her cannot form one Church; that the Churches in communion with Rome, as being the majority of Christendom, are the Church; and that therefore Churches, not in communion with her, are no Churches."

for the Tractarian, to whom the Roman pretensions were unthinkable, the problem of disunity remained, and of that two solutions were possible. One was to deny that the Church of Christ in the full and proper sense was in the world at all. The other was to explain the Note of Unity in some way less exacting than had been generally understood in the history of the Church. Something of the former is found in Newman: "When we are asked 'Where is the Church?' I can but answer, 'Where it *was*'—the Church only *is* while it is one. . . ." [20] This, however, is but a passing phase. More often, and in keeping with the rest of the school, it is to the second alternative that he directs his attention.

Newman on Unity

But that there is something lacking in the Visible Church at present is the feeling of all the Tractarians, of whom Newman, Keble, and Palmer may be taken as representative. Perhaps the depth of the mental struggle in Newman and the long period of uncertainty are responsible for some measure of inconsistency in his view of the Visible Church. "The Church," he is led to admit, "after all . . . is invisible in

[20] *Letters of J. H. Newman,* new ed., 1898, Vol. ii, p. 357. (Letter to Ven. W. R. Lyall, July 16, 1842.)

its day, and faith only apprehends it." [21] This view by itself is not devoid of inspiration. There is a spirituality in it which constitutes its strength. But it can be held only so long as the eye can rest, and is content to rest, on spiritual unities and measurements. And it is exposed to the criticism that it is unknown to the Greek and Roman Churches, being rather a product of the Reformation in England.[22] Another weakness is that it seems to sanction schism, by not insisting on unity in the realm of the visible. Newman, from an early date, is unable to reconcile himself wholly to it, and speaks, as it were, with two voices.[23]

Keble feels that this lack in the Visible Church leaves a void which nothing can fill. "Think as highly as we may of the comparative purity of particular Churches, Roman, Oriental, or Anglican, in doctrine and worship, still the thought of separation from very great companies of Christian people cannot but hang heavy on the heart of anyone who has tried to

Keble

[21] J. H. Newman, *Prophetical Office of the Church,* 1837, p. 393.

[22] *Cp.* A. C. Headlam, Bampton Lectures, 1920, pp. 197 ff.

[23] *Cp., e.g.,* his views in *Parochial Sermons,* Vol. iv, 1839 (Sermon xi, on "The Communion of Saints"): "We know that out of the Church is no salvation;—I mean out of that great invisible company. . . . The *invisible* body is the true Church." And in *The Prophetical Office of the Church,* 1837, p. 230: "A visible Church only can be a stay and maintenance of the Truth."

realize our Lord's declaration about unity. . . . In short, turn our eyes which way we will, decay and degradation seem to meet them, because the Church is no longer visibly *one*." [24] In the same volume he says that, visible unity being "interrupted, we can but go on . . . each one in obedience to the portion of the Church in which his own lot has been cast. . . . And so we are preserved, though not in visible, yet as we may hope in real mystical union." [25]

In the same strain writes Palmer.[26] That there should be but one organization is, according to him, the normal, the ideal, the will of Christ Himself. But it is undeniable that this is not the present state of things.[27] He then goes further than most, and proceeds to show that as a matter of fact there was never given a "guarantee that the Church was to be exempt from frailties, passions, errors, ignorance, and therefore divisions are possible." [28] And such there have been from the first, commencing

Palmer

[24] John Keble, *Sermons Academical and Occasional,* 1847, p. 300 (In sermon on "Endurance of Church Imperfections," 1841).

[25] *Ibid.,* Preface, page xlv.

[26] William Palmer, of Worcester College. To avoid confusion, his namesake, of Magdalen College, following a suggestion from Tractarian writings, will be referred to in the following pages as "*Deacon* Palmer."

[27] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Chapter iv, especially Section iv.

[28] *Ibid.,* Vol. I, Part I, Chapter iv, Section iii.

with the disturbances at Corinth in Apostolic days, and encountered at different times in the Pre-Reformation period.[29] But this situation is one of the misfortunes of the Church, and does not do away with the ideal, the original divine purpose that there should be one "fold." [30] It will be found, however, that Palmer does not strictly adhere to expressions consistent with his theory, but is apt to indulge in language to which no Evangelical can take exception. Commenting on the words "one fold," he says that Christ "meant that they shall be *one* in *spiritual privileges;* and this unity might well subsist, even if external communion were sometimes interrupted through misunderstandings or infirmities." [31] In the same way he makes the Apostle Paul's phrase "One body *in Christ*" mean "spiritually united to Him as their head, animated by one spirit of faith and charity, and continuing to be the one way of salvation, though for a time, through mutual misunderstandings, there should be an estrangement between some portions of the Church." [32]

But this spiritual interpretation is not dis-

[29] *E.g.* in the fifth, ninth, eleventh, fourteenth centuries. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Ch. iv, Sec. iv.

[30] John 10:16. Authorized version. (The Revised Version speaks of "flock.") The reference is as in [29].

[31] Reference as in [29].

[32] Reference as in [29].

tinctive, and can be claimed also by Dissenters as their own view and peculiar heritage. It does not meet the need for a Visible Church as the Tractarians conceived it. It requires supplementing, and this was done by the affirmation that the divisions in the Catholic Church of Greek, Roman, and Anglican, though unfortunately they are the cause of interruption of communion, do not break up the unity of the Church of Christ. This is the Branch Theory, a full description of which can best be given in Newman's words, written in 1882:

The Branch Theory

"Palmer" [that is, Deacon William Palmer of Magdalen College], "deeply convinced of the great truth that our Lord had instituted, and still acknowledges and protects, a visible Church—one, individual, and integral—Catholic, as spread over the earth, Apostolic as co-eval with the Apostles of Christ, and Holy, as being the dispenser of His Word and Sacraments—considered it at present to exist in three main branches, or rather in a triple presence, the Latin, the Greek, and the Anglican, these three being one and the same Church, distinguishable from each other only by secondary, fortuitous, and local, though important, characteristics. And, whereas the whole Church in its fulness was, as they believed, at once and severally Anglican, Greek, and Latin, so in turn each one of those three was the whole Church; whence it followed that, whenever any one of the three was present, the

other two, by the nature of the case, were absent, and therefore the three could not have direct relations with each other, as if they were three substantive bodies, there being no real difference between them except the external accident of place. Moreover since, as has been said, on a given territory, there could not be more than one of the three, it followed that Christians generally, wherever they were, were bound to recognize, and had a claim to be recognized by, that one, ceasing to belong to the Anglican Church, as Anglican, when they were at Rome, and ignoring Rome as Rome, when they found themselves at Moscow. Lastly, not to acknowledge this inevitable outcome of the initial idea of the Church, *viz.*, that it was both everywhere and one, was bad logic, and to act in opposition to it was nothing short of setting up altar against altar, that is, the hideous sin of schism and a sacrilege.

"This I conceive to be the formal teaching of Anglicanism; this is what we held and professed in Oxford forty years ago." [33]

A consequence of the Branch Theory was the adoption of the name "Anglo-Catholic." The insistence on the Catholicity of the Anglican Church demanded the regular use of the name Catholic, but in some form calculated to distinguish the Anglican branch from the other two. For some years "Reformed Catholic" was used, but this term was, in the long run, bound

[33] J. H. Newman, Introduction to (Deacon) William Palmer's *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the years 1840, 1841.* 1882, pages v-vii.

to be rejected, because it suggested a *different* Catholicity, instead of the merely local division of the one Catholicity shared by the entire Church. Consistently with the Theory as given above, the distinction to be implied in the name would need to be simply geographical. Originally "English Catholic," corresponding to "Roman Catholic" and "Greek Catholic," [34] the Tractarians' self-designation came to assume, not later than 1838, the form "Anglo-Catholic." [35]

The Branch Theory, though strange to the generation of a century ago, was not new to Anglican theology. The Fathers of the Anglican Church had held it, and its conceptions had entered into their very devotions.[36] Though wanting the thoroughness and consistency of the Roman doctrine, it is an advance upon it because of its greater spirituality and its courage in facing facts. It does not shrink from acknowledging that perfect outward unity does not now exist. On the other hand, it breaks through the limits imposed on the idea of the Church by

[34] J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons,* Vol. 3, 1837. Sermon on "Submission to Church Authority," pages 209-210: "We are the English Catholics; abroad are the Roman Catholics, some of whom are among ourselves; elsewhere are the Greek Catholics. . . ."

[35] See Appendix to this Chapter, on the Name "Anglo-Catholic."

[36] *E.g.,* Hooker, *Eccl. Pol.,* Book III, Section 14. See discussion in T. A. Lacey, *Unity of the Church as Treated by English Theologians,* 1898, pp. 20 ff. *Cp.* also Bishop Andrewes' *Devotions.*

that inflexible logic which, in the interest of a theory, proceeds to unchurch large sections of Christendom. Rather it believes that it can see the Church of Christ in that wider Society which includes the Eastern and the Roman Communions as well as the Anglican; and it has spiritual insight to see the unity that does persist, and that binds the three Branches together, despite their blindness or their temporary antagonisms.[37] It is true it limits the Church to Episcopal bodies, and to that extent exhibits narrowness. It has none of the spirit of the recent Lambeth "Appeal to all Christian People" (1920), and is at variance with the view of the "Memorandum on the Status of the Existing Free Church Ministry" submitted by the Angli-

[37] *Cp.* J. H. Newman, in "The Catholicity of the English Church" (in the *British Critic,* January 1840), p. 74: ". . . Insisting as (the Romanists) do, on intercommunion as an essential mark of the Church, they are obliged to make its Catholicity in no small degree a mere fiction of law. Surely it is but a legal fiction that there is a Church in England, if the Roman Communion be it, compared with the full and adequate truth of the proposition, supposing it be possible, in spite of the differences of faith and discipline between England and Rome, to call them one and the same Church, extending into the two countries. And this applies still more strongly to the case of the Greek Church; for in what sense can the Church of Rome be said to extend through the vast spaces of Russia, except on that pen and paper plan which gives them an indefinite abundance of bishops *in partibus infidelium*? If then intercommunion be a note of the Church, reality is one also; and if Roman divines would not have to create a territory for themselves by mapping it, and to appropriate it by compasses, they must relax their ideas, high and primitive though they be, of the intercommunity and brotherly affection of the various portions of the present Catholic Church."

can members of the Joint Conference at Lambeth Palace, July 6, 1923, in which they declare, regarding "the ministries of those communions which do not possess the episcopate," that "they do not call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of these ministries," and that these same, "which imply a sincere intention to preach Christ's Word and administer the Sacraments as Christ has ordained, and to which authority so to do has been solemnly given by the Church concerned, are real ministries of Christ's Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church." [38] Nevertheless, compared with the Roman view the Branch Theory represents a decided advance, in that it is less disposed to restrict the workings of the Spirit.

There are, however, weaknesses in the Theory,[39] the chief being that two of the three

[38] *Reunion. The Lambeth Conference Report and the Free Churches.* S. P. C. K., London, 1924, pp. 14, 15.

[39] There is a superficial criticism which, choosing to assume that the figure is taken from the branches of a tree, goes on to play havoc with it, and to show its supposed contradictions or absurdities. This is a favorite method of Roman controversialists. *Cp., e.g.,* Adrian Fortescue's pamphlet on *The Branch Theory,* n. d., page 19. It is probable that some of those who have held the theory have given cause for such comments through their having been loose in their thinking or inexact in their language. At least, it is more satisfactory to interpret in this way, rather than as a deliberate distortion of the Theory, such language as F. W. Faber's soon after his secession: "When did this theory of 'Branch' Churches begin, for it is strange-sounding language. Are all the Churches *branch* Churches? Is there no *trunk* Church? If there is, where is it? If it be the Roman, a branch cut off, solemnly sawed away by the teeth

Branches are in mutual estrangement and wilful isolation, refusing to consider themselves coördinate Branches of the One Church. However generous and wide-embracing the Anglican idea is in this respect, both Rome and the East repudiate it, each insisting on its own exclusive claims. The answer given to these objections is that these communions, notwithstanding their protests to the contrary, are by no means separated from the greater whole. "Mutual intercourse is but an *accident* of the Church, not of its essence." [40] Absence of intercommunion therefore does not necessarily break up the unity of the Church.

Weaknesses in the Theory

But since the Note of Unity is not found in its full and original sense at the present time, the Branch Theory does not eliminate the problem of division in the Church. As, however, it

---

of an excommunication, need not boast much of its branchship," etc. (In *Life and Letters of F. W. Faber,* pp. 248-9. Date of pamphlet in which these words are found is January 10, 1846.)

But the figure, as has been pointed out, is only used to mark geographical divisions of the One Church. See the extract from Newman's writings on pages 22, 23, *ante.* See also footnote 36 for refs. The ref. to Hooker is: "As the main body of the sea being one, yet within divers precincts hath divers names; so the Catholic Church is in like sort divided into a number of distinct Societies, every one of which is termed a Church within itself." The figure is from the branches of the sea, not those of a tree.

[40] J. H. Newman, in "Catholicity of the English Church" (*British Critic,* January, 1840, p. 55). This entire subject is dealt with in Palmer's *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Part I, Ch. iv, Sec. iv.

maintains that some kind of visible unity, nevertheless, does survive, it must point out what are its indications. These it finds in the fact of the common possession by the Coördinate Branches of the three other Notes given in the Creed, *viz.*, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity.

2. Holiness

Less stress is laid on the Note of Holiness than on the other three, which may be partly accounted for by the accidental omission of the word "holy" from the Prayer-Book version of the Nicene Creed.[41] The subject, however, is treated carefully and at length by Palmer in a chapter entitled The Sanctity of the Church. The scope of the discussion and the nature of its conclusions are sufficiently indicated by the titles of the sections of the chapter: The sanctity of its Head, and of those who founded it; The holiness of its doctrine seen in its effects and requirements; The means of holiness which it has in the Sacraments; The divine attestations of holiness in miracles.[42]

In general, among these writers the inter-

[41] Harford & Stevenson, Prayer Book Dictionary, art. "Nicene Creed." John Dowden, *Workmanship of the Prayer Book,* pp. 104-6, 2d ed., 1902, discusses the omission. It should be borne in mind, however, that the expression occurs in the *Apostles'* Creed: "The *holy* Catholic Church."

[42] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. vi, 3d Ed.

pretation oscillates between the views which, for convenience' sake, may be called respectively the "spiritual" and the "ecclesiastical." But the greater tendency is to give expression to the ecclesiastical aspect. Newman, for example, declares that the Early Tractarians, himself included, understood the Church to be holy as "being the dispenser of the Word and Sacraments." [43]

3. Catholicity

The idea of Catholicity is fundamental to the whole Tractarian position. The very word "Catholic" was now rescued from disuse. The Oxford Movement considered itself a Catholic Revival, and the leaders proclaimed themselves Anglo-Catholics.[44]

In the endeavour to prove the right of the Anglican claim to Catholicity, emphasis was laid on the essential antagonism of Protestantism and Catholicism, the only good seen by some in the former being its opposition to certain errors of Romanism.[45] Representative utterances are found in Rose and Oakeley, the one a conservative High Anglican, the other inclined to Romanism. The former writes: "If

[43] See extract on page 22.

[44] See page 24, *ante*.

[45] Deacon Palmer will not grant even this. See his Letter to C. P. Golightly, 1841, pp. 10-11, for Anathemas on Protestantism.

it be Protestantism to doubt of every sacred truth, or at least to receive none with confidence, may that gracious Providence which has ever yet preserved our Church, preserve her still from the curse of Protestantism." [46] To Oakeley, Protestantism is "a tone of mind . . . faithless, presumptuous, and irreverent." [47] The "Protestant *principle* (is) faulty . . . as contradistinguished not from Popery, but from Catholicism. Catholicism *as distinguished from Popery,* is an essentially divine, Protestantism, *as contrasted with it,* an essentially human and worldly, principle. And this, because Catholicism regards man in the light in which the Bible regards him, as the humble and teachable recipient of heavenly truth; whereas *mere* Protestantism esteems him . . . a critic of mysteries, and a framer of his own creed." [48] The "tone of mind" is further condemned because "it is the natural result of measuring religion by the reason and feelings of the individual, and by its present effects, instead of looking habitually away from self to an Object without us, and testing the value of things seen by the experi-

[46] H. J. Rose, *State of Protestantism in Germany,* 2d ed., 1829, p. 29.

[47] F. Oakeley, *Explanation of a Passage . . . on Bp. Jewel,* 1842, page 30.

[48] F. Oakeley, *Sermons preached chiefly . . . at Whitehall,* 1839, Preface, page xii.

ence of a more real world withdrawn from sense." [49]

From these extracts it is evident that the Catholicism advocated means that submission to authority is the ideal; and at least it implies that doctrines have been finally settled, that fearless criticism is to be discouraged or its sphere limited, and that the seat of authority is without rather than within the man. This involves the rejection of the opposite tendency, at the present time variously described as liberalism, democracy, modernism, which was believed by Tractarians to be essential to Protestantism.

The defining of Catholicity, however, seems to present difficulties. For an affirmation of the fact of a Catholic Church reference was made to the Nicene Creed; for an authoritative way of deciding whether a thing was Catholic or not, the appeal was always to the Vincentian Canon; but in the matter of definition of this principle there is no unanimity. Sometimes Catholicity is identified with world-wide diffusion:

"We find the fathers not merely asserting the fact, that the church of Christ was really diffused throughout the whole world; but arguing, that the church of which they were members must be the true church,

[49] F. Oakeley, continuation of ref. 47 above, page 30.

because it was so diffused, and that the societies of heretics which claimed to be *the only true church,* could not be so, from their deficiency in this essential characteristic." [50]

Or else, Catholicity is in the intention:

"The Holy Church is Catholic, as being intended for all ages and all nations of men." [51]

Or it may be in the completeness of a doctrinal system:

"In this sense again the Holy Church is Catholic, because it receives and teaches the whole of Christ's truth. . . . The Catholic or Universal Church may be known by its teaching the whole Creed, the whole truth of Scripture, to all without distinction of time and place." [52]

Or again, the British Churches are said to be Catholic because

"they acknowledge the catholic church, respect its authority, receive its faith, and have never been cut off from it." [53]

But the main points of Early Tractarian teaching on this subject are clear: the Church

---

[50] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Part I, Ch. vii, "On the Universality of the Church." Section 1 of this chapter argues that, according to Scripture, the Church was to be morally universal, or to be propagated in all nations. *Cp.* Newman, *ante.* p. 22.

[51] John Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year,* Vol. 6, p. 174. (Sermon xvii, on "The Church Catholic.")

[52] John Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year,* Vol. 6, p. 175.

[53] W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Part I, Ch. x, Section v. Note in this 3d ed., Addendum ("On the name Catholic") to Chapter vii.

Catholic ideally should be one visible, undivided Society, possessing all the notes mentioned in the Creed. Unfortunately that of Unity is in certain respects lacking. Yet oneness in some measure persists because of the retention of the ancient Episcopal Ministry, and the body of doctrine handed down from the undivided Church.

4. Apostolicity

Of the four Notes of the Church, however, that of Apostolicity receives the greatest stress, and is understood to refer chiefly to the fact and the form of the Christian Ministry. The Anglican formularies, it is true, say comparatively little about it.[54] It was one of the tasks of the Oxford Movement to bring it to the notice of the English Church. Tract I was well calculated to excite interest in the subject, and to make the clergy ask themselves if they believed in Apostolical Succession or not. The interest thus revived was further kindled by numerous other tracts in the same series.[55] It was inevitable that Apostolicity should receive the prom-

---

[54] E. B. Pusey, *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,* 1839, 146 ff. It is there pointed out that whereas Article XXIII is indefinite on the subject of Succession and Episcopal Ordination, it is otherwise in the Preface to "the Form and Manner of making, ordaining, and consecrating, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

[55] The chief tracts dealing with the subject of the Apostolic Succession are: 1, 4, 7, 10, 24, 33, 35, 42, 52, 54, 57, 60, 74.

inence it did, seeing that the Anglicanism of that day could not claim, except with some measure of uncertainty, either the Note of Unity or the full doctrine of traditional Orthodoxy; whereas it could point with confidence to its possession of an Apostolic Ministry.

Theoretically the idea of a Succession in the Ministry is quite distinct from that of Episcopacy, and it is well that the distinction should ever be kept in mind. But, as a matter of fact, the two are historically connected and are thus emphasized in Tractarian writings. The Apostolical Succession of which they speak is transmitted by the imposition of Episcopal hands. "The only correct ground is, that Episcopacy is the originally appointed and *sole* way of transmitting the commission to teach mankind, and administer the Christian ordinances; a commission which is essential to the Christian ministry, and which, to be valid, must proceed from the great Head of the church, through that channel in which His apostles, whom He authorized for the purpose, originally placed it." [56]

More than anything else, it is the Succession that safeguards the Church's Unity. Says Newman, "The Anglican view, then, of the Church

---

[56] Hugh James Rose, *State of Protestantism in Germany*, 2d ed., 1829, page 25, footnote.

has ever been this, that its portions need not otherwise have been united together for their essential completeness, than as being descended from one original. . . . The Apostolical Succession is necessary in order to their possessing claim of descent. . . ." [57] And again, he refers to "The Anglican theory of ecclesiastical unity, (which is) that each Church is naturally independent of every other; each bishop a complete channel of grace, and ultimate center of unity; and all unions of see with see but matters of ecclesiastical arrangement. . . ." [58]

Such teaching was not new, but the emphasis laid on it certainly was. From an early date "Catholic" Churches assumed it to be an indispensable part of the constitution of the Christian Church. The Early Tractarians revived that attitude. One result of their insistence on the Succession through the Episcopate was to ensure that reunion with "Evangelical," that is, non-Episcopal Communions, should be out of the question, and that if the Church of England did move toward Reunion at all, it would be with episcopal bodies, particu-

[57] J. H. Newman, "Catholicity of the English Church" (*British Critic,* January, 1840), page 54.

[58] J. H. Newman, same ref. as last. The entire article ("Catholicity of the English Church") is important as bearing largely on the question of the Apostolic Succession. The quotation above is on page 62 of the *British Critic,* Jan., 1840.

larly with the Roman and with the Eastern Church.

The Tractarian Theory, then, professed to be that of the Early Church and the Councils. According to it, the Church of Christ was to be known by its possession of those Notes of Unity, Holiness, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, which are predicated of it in the Nicene Creed. On the question of Unity the Tractarians' view was peculiar to themselves, but, as regards the other three Notes, it will be found that their interpretation was in close sympathy with the doctrine of the East.

IV. Application of the Theory.

The practical end in view in the developing of the Theory was the elimination of the chaos in current Anglican opinion on the subject of the Church and, on the other hand, the proving that the Church of England conformed to the pattern of the Ancient Church in every essential particular. Such being the aim, it was necessary to show that here was neither a new institution nor a schism from an older body, nor yet a body inculcating novelty in doctrine.

1. As to the Church of England

Because so much depended on it, there is steady insistence on the fact that the Church of

England, which is of greater antiquity than its Roman connection, is not a schism from the Catholic Church. Palmer gives a careful account of this view.[59] He has no difficulty in showing that before Augustine's mission[60] there was a Christian Church in the British Isles; that the Papal connection came later, and was but an interlude in the Church's life; and that the ending of it at the Reformation, far from being a new departure, was a reversion to the original position of the Church of England. His contention is, that "the Church of England never did at any time, by any voluntary act whatever, *separate herself from the communion of the universal* church," [61] and he defies opponents to "name any English synod, any article, any authentic document whatever, which proves that the Church of England did, either in act or intention, voluntarily separate or cut

[59] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Ch. x ("On the British Churches"). Also the whole of Part II ("On the British Reformation"); esp. Appendix ("On the Identity of the Reformed and Unreformed Church of England") to Pt. II, Ch. vii.

[60] Perhaps some would say, even in the first generation of Christians. *Cp.* A. P. Perceval, *Origines Hibernicae,* 1849. He believes that Ireland is the Patmos of the Apocalypse, and that the Virgin Mary is buried there. He thinks there is reason for taking seriously the view of the old records, to the effect that "all the immediate friends of our Lord sought refuge in the far west, even in the extreme isles of Britain, Joseph of Arimathea being one, who shared with St. John the care of the Mother of our Lord" (page 26).

[61] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Ch. x; Vol. I, Part II, Ch. ii, Section vi (pp. 339-342).

herself off from the communion of the rest of the universal church." [62] Separating from the Roman connection was not necessarily being cut off from the Church of Christ, seeing it was by no means proven either that the Roman was the sole Church, or that the Roman Pontiff was by divine institution the center of unity.[63] The anathemas of Rome therefore did not render the Church of England schismatical, because these did not constitute Oecumenical excommunication.[64] Nor was it an indication of schism that Anglicanism was not in actual communion with the rest of the Catholic Church, since for various reasons "different portions of the catholic church may for a time be separated from mutual communion." [65]

But the controversy with Rome brought the issue into prominence. To prove the Anglican

---

[62] *Ibid.,* Vol. I, Part I, Ch. x, Section ii (p. 177). At the other extreme, William Palmer, of Magdalen College, speaks in the same strain. His contention in Russia was: "We never separated by any synodical act from the communion of the Latin Churches, nor from that of the Eastern either" (*Notes of a Visit,* etc., p. 229). Similarly Pusey, among others; *e.g.,* "We have remained since the Reformation, as before, a branch of the Church Catholic; we were placed on no new platform; our Reformers did not, like Luther, form for us any new system of doctrine, such as that which bears his name; they ever appealed to Catholic antiquity; submitted their own judgment to hers" (*Letter to R. W. Jelf,* 1841, page 8).

[63] *Ibid.,* Vol. I, Pt. I. Ch. x, Sec. ii. *Cp.* also page 231; 1st edition, 1838, Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. x, Sec. iii.

[64] *Ibid.,* p. 177 (Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. x, Sec. ii).

[65] *Ibid.,* p. 179.

Church schismatical was the aim of Rome's protagonists, and against such dire result the whole forces of the Tractarians were directed.[66] It was shown to be the most formidable weapon Rome could have chosen, and the skill and success with which Wiseman used it are now a matter of history. In answer to it they sought to prove the continuity of the Church of England not only by the fact of an unbroken succession in its Ministry,[67] but also by its possessing the whole doctrinal heritage of antiquity. The teaching of the Oecumenical Councils is hers. "The Catholic and Universal Church may be known by its teaching the whole Creed, the whole saving truth of Scripture." [68] But while claiming all this for his Church, Keble would nevertheless limit the validity of Tradition to certain aspects only, that is, to "those rules, in which *all* primitive Councils are uniform, those rites and formularies which are found in *all* primitive Liturgies, and those interpretations and principles of interpretation in which *all* or-

[66] *Cp.* Newman's *Apologia,* Part V; Pusey, *Letter to the Archbishop,* 2d ed., 1842, p. 118; Church, *Oxford Movement,* Chapters xi and xii.

[67] The fact of an "Apostolic Ministry," *i.e.,* of the Episcopacy, is unquestioned; that it has gone on by unbroken succession is what they feel called on to defend. *Cp.* Palmer, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pp. 188-192 (Pt. I, Ch. x, Sec. vi).

[68] Keble, *Sermons for the Christian Year,* Vol. VI, Sermon xvii (on "The Church Catholic"), page 175.

thodox Fathers agree."[69] These "genuine canons of the primitive Councils, and the genuine fragments of the primitive Liturgies, are reducible into a small space; even although we go so low down in both as the division of the Eastern and Western Churches, including the six first Councils general, and excluding image-worship and similar corruptions by authority."[70]

The last extract brings out one difference between the Tractarians and the Eastern Orthodox which is discussed at length in the next chapter. A frequent boast of the former is that the Church of England, while in truth the same Church as of old, has undergone a Reformation.[71] Not all indeed agree that this is a matter for satisfaction, some holding instead, with Deacon Palmer, that "she has rather been *de*formed than *re*formed."[72] But where the

[69] Keble, *Primitive Tradition,* 1836, page 40.

[70] *Ibid.,* page 40.

[71] So Palmer, *Treatise,* etc., 3d ed., Vol. I, the whole of Part II ("On the British Reformation"). *Cp.* W. F. Hook, *Reasons for Contributing Toward the Support of an English Bishop at Jerusalem,* 1842, esp. pp. 4-12. But there is an anti-Reformation group, chief among whom are Deacon Palmer of Magdalen, and W. G. Ward (*cp.* his *Ideal of a Christian Church,* esp. pp. 55, 121-2). So Oakeley, who—where Palmer of Worcester College sees the chief characteristic of the Church of England in her being a Reformed Church—rather takes it to be her "ambiguous character" (*i.e.,* neither Catholic nor Protestant), and her "Erastianism"; somewhat after the supercilious manner of W. G. Ward (Oakeley, *Explanation of a Passage . . . on Bp. Jewel,* p. 18).

[72] Deacon Palmer's *Notes of a Visit,* etc., pp. 513-514. On the Pro-Reformation side, add, W. F. Hook, Letter upon the Jerusalem

English Reformation is upheld it is largely on the strength of the rejection in England of such Roman practices or beliefs as Purgatory, the Mass, the Invocation of the Virgin and Saints, and Image-worship.[73] But Image-worship had been dealt with and authorized by the Second Nicene, or Seventh Oecumenical, Council, 787 A.D. It is not surprising therefore that the validity and oecumenicity of that Council should be denied. This rejection of the Second Nicene Council constitutes one of the important respects in which the Church of England, as the Tractarians understood it, differs from the Eastern Church in a fundamental of the faith.

2. As to the Eastern Church

The Theory of the Church advocated by the Early Tractarians was believed by them to be also that of the East.[74] This was not an exaggeration. The conviction was due to unerring instinct, but it was supplemented by other considerations. It was known, for example, that the only Notes of the Church, according to the East, were those of the Nicene clause; and precisely these were stressed by the Anglo-Cath-

---

Bishopric, quoted in *Correspondence illustrative of the actual state of Oxford,* etc., 1842, p. 4.

[73] Palmer of Worcester College, *Examination . . . of . . . Sibthorp's Reasons,* 1842, p. 23; Supplement to an Examination (of same), pp. 11-5.

[74] Keble, *Sermons Academical,* 1847, Preface xxxvii.

olics. Moreover, the increasing interest in the Oriental Communion, and the contributions of Alexander Knox and his disciple Bishop Jebb, had not been without result.[75] Alexander Knox had taught that the Greek Church represented the original body of Christendom; that the Church of England perpetuated the Greek tradition; and that since she represented this tradition rather than the Latin, she should seek an understanding of, and an approach to the Churches of the East.[76]

But while the two communions were understood to be in fundamental agreement regarding the Theory of the Church, the Eastern Theory was felt to be vague and exclusive. In some measure the criticism of vagueness is just, because the genius of the East, being less interested in organization than in the guardianship of the truth, has given less attention to ecclesiastical theory. The Western mind, on the contrary, is systematic and insists on organization; and the Anglican Church was largely in line with the Western tendency in this respect. It is interesting in this connection to note the

[75] *Cp. Remains of Alexander Knox,* Vols. I-IV, esp. Vols. III and IV (*re* years 1809-1810). Also *Thirty Years' Correspondence Between John Jebb and Alexander Knox,* edited by Charles Forster (*e.g.,* Vol. I, p. 350).

[76] *Remains of Alexander Knox,* Vol. III, pp. 210, 211 (*re* 1806). See article on Alexander Knox in *Dictionary of National Biography.*

frequency of the word "Catholic" among the Tractarians, and the constant recurrence to the idea for which it stands; whereas the Russians, on the other hand, manifested such a disinclination to discuss the term, and such misapprehension of it, as to leave Deacon Palmer exasperated.[77] The Eastern Church, though asserting its right to both ideas, places the emphasis on Orthodoxy rather than Catholicity.

Again, the Eastern Communion, though it dwells less on this aspect, is as exclusive as the Roman. "The Holy Church, after the falling away of many schisms, and of the Roman Patriarchate, was preserved in the Greek Eparchies[78] and Patriarchates, and only those communities can acknowledge one another as fully Christian which preserve their unity with the Eastern Patriarchates or enter into that unity." [79] This exclusiveness is connected with the question of Orthodoxy, which, it is maintained, has been determined and defined by the Seven Oecumenical Councils. The Eastern Church is the true Church because it accepts these in their entirety and does not presume to

---

[77] W. Palmer, *Notes of a Visit,* etc., Chapters 24, 33, 38, 44, 46, 64.

[78] "Eparchy" is the common term in Russia for "diocese."

[79] A. S. Khomiakoff, essay on "The Unity of the Church." In W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church,* p. 222.

advance upon them. The sections of Christendom which differ from her tolerate in certain respects, by omission or addition, something of error, and therefore, having no unity of faith with her, cannot be part of the true Church. Communion with the East could, however, be restored on proof of Orthodoxy being given; that is to say, on the acceptance in the same way by these other Churches of the Seven Councils. The estrangement of the Church of England from the Oriental branch could be brought to an end precisely along these lines.

This is what Deacon Palmer recognized when he undertook to write his *Harmony of Anglican and Eastern Doctrine.* The idea of that work is that fundamentally there is no heresy in the Anglican Church; and a judicious selection of utterances from Anglican Fathers makes out a plausible case. It certainly shows the insight of the author into the nature of the problem, and of the cause of this estrangement. But it did not escape the notice of ecclesiastics in Russia that Anglicanism as a whole did not and would not subscribe to Palmer's theories;[80] and that if there was to be dogmatic union on the terms suggested by him, in that

[80] Khomiakoff to Palmer, 1846 (in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church,* pages 70 f). For Palmer's view of identity of doctrine, see *ibid.,* p. 24.

work and elsewhere, it would first be found necessary to expel from the Church of England the section attached to the Reformation and which for that reason did not accept all the Seven Councils.

Conclusion

The discussion in this chapter has been intended to show the place of Early Tractarianism in that theological approximation to the East which has been associated with the modern Anglican movement toward Reunion. The Notes of the Church upon which the Tractarians insisted were those also emphasized by the Orthodox. There was, further, the aim to prove that notwithstanding expressions to the contrary, variations in practice, and non-adherence to the letter of certain canons, the faith of the Anglican Church agreed with that of the Eastern. And there is the recognition that the difficulty is reduced to this: what, precisely, is of faith? Let this be settled and union may follow. In this connection, therefore, Early Tractarianism served a useful purpose, both by what it included and what it left undetermined: it limited the field of controversy and enquiry, and reduced it to the question of whether the Church of England accepts the whole, and no more than the whole, of Oecumenical truth.

Chapter II.

Appendix A

THE NAME "ANGLO-CATHOLIC"

There have been enquiries from time to time into the origin of the term, a special instance being the discussion in the columns of the (London) Anglican weekly, *The Guardian,* during the summer of 1923. In that correspondence the word was traced as far back as 1840. That it was in use then is confirmed by the fact of the "Library of *Anglo-Catholic* Theology," the first volume of which bears the date "Feast of the Circumcision, 1841," that is, January 1st. But there are still earlier instances of its use.

A warning, however, is needed when noting its occurrence in Newman's writings. In the 3d edition of *The Prophetical Office of the Church* (1877) the term is frequently to be met, *e.g.,* in the Introduction, Sec. 13, and Lecture I, Sec. 11. The original Preface, as repeated in that edition, bears the date "Feast of St. Matthias, 1837" (Feb. 24). This is misleading, in

that it suggests that the contents of the volume follow the first edition. But in the 1837 edition the passages in question speak of "Anglicans" and "Anglicanism," not of "Anglo-Catholicism" or "Anglo-Catholics." The term does not seem to be in the first edition at all. But it is possible that the way was being prepared for it by such passages as: "Our Articles were, in the first instance, a test . . . whether the clergy of the Church Catholic in England were willing to exercise their ministry on certain conditions," etc. (1st ed., page 279); and, "The accents of the Church Catholic and Apostolic as it manifests itself in England" (*Ibid.*, page 314).

But Newman does use the term in 1838, in the *British Critic,* October, 1838, article on "Palmer's *Treatise on the Church of Christ,*" page 354: "God has given us . . . *directions* what to do. So far all parties, Romanist, Sectarian, and Anglo-Catholic agree."

An earlier instance than this of Newman's is in the *British Critic,* July, 1838, page 85, article by C. de Bas[1] on "Newman and Faber on Justification": "And lastly, both of them appeal to the Homilies and Formularies of the Anglo-Catholic Church."

[1] That C. de Bas (given also as "le Bas") is the author appears from certain unpublished notes of Newman's. Father Francis Bacchus of the Oratory, Birmingham, England, has kindly supplied this information.

William Palmer of Worcester College in his *Treatise on the Church,* 3d edition, 1842, uses the term in the Preface, page ix; in Vol. I, Part I, Chapter x; and in several other places. It is found also in the First edition, 1838, but less frequently; *e.g.,* Preface, 1838, page vi, speaks of "those ancient errors against which the masters of Anglo-catholic theology contended in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries"; and on pages 527-533 the "Anglo-Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist" is the title used for that particular section.

The term does not seem to be in the *British Critic* of 1836 and 1837. In July 1837, page 232, in a review of Sermons by Hook and others, it says: "Mr. Hook . . . claims for our Church, according to the satisfactory and interesting statement of Mr. Palmer, the name of the 'Old Catholic Church of England.' " In October, 1836, page 340, it discusses "the answer of the *Reformed* Catholic to the *Roman* Catholic."

The term "Reformed Catholic" was probably a frequent self-designation of the Tractarians during the first years of the Oxford Movement. A belated attempt to advocate its claims was made by "A Catholic" in the *Christian Remembrancer* of August, 1842, pages

208-215. The writer nowhere alludes to "Anglo-Catholic" either as used in his time, or as a possible alternative.

It would be interesting to discover the first instance of the use of the term Anglo-Catholic. So far, the foregoing references suggest that about 1838 it had become an understood and recognized term, but that it had to contend against the rival "Reformed Catholic" for a while. Its ultimate success was no doubt due to the geographical requirements of the Branch Theory.

Appendix B

CORRESPONDENCES BETWEEN TRACTARIAN AND ORTHODOX THEOLOGY

A VALUABLE WORK, useful in showing the affinity between Tractarians and Orthodox, is Philaret's *Comparative Statement of Russo-Greek and Roman Catholic Doctrines,* which was written about 1815 for private use by Philaret when he was Archimandrite at St. Petersburg. It forms No. IV of the "Papers of the Russo-Greek Committee" of New York. This translation bears no date, but it was issued about 1866.

In that pamphlet Philaret gives in parallel form the differences on important doctrines between Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism. It can be readily seen that where the Orthodox view differs from the Roman, it bears a striking resemblance to Anglican teaching, and especially to the Tractarian form of it.

As illustrating further the theological approximations of the latter to Eastern theology,

a brief comparison is given herewith of Tractarian and Post-Oecumenical Orthodox pronouncements, dealing with the subjects which may be considered fundamental to the entire Tractarian system: the Oecumenical Councils and Primitive Tradition.

An asterisk prefixed to a passage indicates that the translation is that found in Appendix I of J. A. Douglas' *The Relations of the Anglican Churches With the Eastern Orthodox.*

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS

Dependence on:

(Constantinople Letter, *i.e.*, "The Answer of the Great Church of Constantinople to Leo XIII," 1895.)

* The Orthodox Eastern Church . . . justly glories in Christ as being the Church of the seven Oecumenical Councils and the first nine centuries of Christianity, and therefore the one holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of Christ.

(TRACTARIAN)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS

Dependence on:

(Pusey, Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, 1839, page 38.)

(The Anglican Divines) appeal to the Authority of the Universal Church as long as it was one. They . . . seek for a genuine Apostolic tradition to be established by the consent of all times, all Churches, and the great doctors of all those Churches.

(Pusey, *ibid.*, page 43.)

Our Divines appeal to the Church, "anterior to the division of the East and West."

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

Finality:

(The Patriarchs' Final Answer to the Non-Jurors, 1723.)

* Those Doctrines have been long since examined, and rightly and religiously defined and settled by the Holy and Oecumenical Synods, and . . . it is neither lawful to add anything to them or take anything from them: and . . . those who are disposed to agree with us in the Divine Doctrines of the Orthodox Faith must necessarily follow and submit to what has been defined and determined by the Decision of the Ancients and Fathers of the Holy and Oecumenical Synods from the time of the Apostles and their Holy Successors.

(Gregory VI's Answer to Pius IX, 1848.)

* The Catholic Faith . . . has long ago been sealed in completeness not to admit of diminution or increase or any change whatever.

(TRACTARIAN)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

Finality:

(Keble, in *Memoir* of Keble, 3d ed., p. 439.)

Is there any way of bringing the dispute to an issue, except only by another true Oecumenical Council, when such may be had?

(Keble, *ibid.*, page 440.)

The question may well be asked . . . whether in the present divided state of Christendom, all who believe in the Holy Catholic Church, must not in reality, however unconsciously, be going on under this very appeal (to an Oecumenical Council) at least against other claimants.

(Hugh James Rose, *State of Protestantism in Germany*, 2d ed., 1829, pp. 26, 27.)

If then it is essential to a Protestant Church to possess a constant power of varying her beliefs, let us remember that ours is no Protestant Church. . . . Here . . . is the marked difference between our own and these

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

Infallibility:

(John Palaeologus at Florence, Sguropoulos, Sect. ix, Cap. x, Creyghton, p. 265.)

* The Holy Church can in no wise be led astray in regard to sacred dogmas when she considers them in common action and in Synod. For two or three or more considering them by themselves, it is admitted, may err. But that the whole Church in common action should err is altogether impossible. . . . Wherefore it necessarily follows that the Church of God is inerrant.

(TRACTARIAN)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

Protestant Churches. Our Church receives only what was received in those ages when truth must have been known.

Infallibility:

(Charles Marriott, *Five Sermons,* 1850, Preface, v.)

Nor is there anything to prevent us from holding in the English Church that which has never been *directly* affirmed by the whole Catholic Church, and which is indirectly, in a certain sufficient sense, inculcated by our own, the infallibility of the Universal Church. We hold in common with all antiquity that the Church hath authority in matters of faith.

(Pusey, Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, 1839, page 44.)

We believe that (although Councils which have been termed "General," or which Rome has claimed to be so, have erred), no real Oecumenical Council ever did; *i.e.,* no Council really representing the Universal Church.

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

(Synodical Answer to the Lovers of the Greek Church in Britain, 1672.)

* Concerning the Catholic Orthodox Church of Christ, we say that it is infallible; as being under the direction of its proper head which is Christ, who is Truth itself, under the Guidance of the Spirit of Truth.

PRIMITIVE TRADITION

Definition:

(The Confession of Metrophanes Kritopoulos, 1625.)

* The traditions of the Church which the Holy Spirit has delivered without writing and mystically are termed the Unwritten Word of God. As such are regarded the traditions concerning the rites of the Holy Sacraments and other helpful things which adorn the Church.

(The Catechism of Peter Mogila, 1640.)

* The Articles of Faith have received their Authority and Approbation partly from the Holy Scriptures,

(TRACTARIAN)

THE OECUMENICAL COUNCILS (Continued)

(Pusey, *ibid.*, page 49.)

The Anglican view regards the promise (of infallibility) as belonging to the universal Church, but restrained to those Articles of the faith which were delivered to her, and which in her real Oecumenical Councils she has defined.

PRIMITIVE TRADITION

Definition:

(Keble, *Primitive Tradition*, 1836, p. 40.)

On the other hand, we cannot deny such claim (to be binding) to those rules, in which *all* primitive Councils are uniform, those rites and formularies which are found in *all* primitive Liturgies, and those interpretations and principles of interpretation in which *all* orthodox Fathers agree; more especially when they produce them as undoubted and authoritative.

(Keble, *ibid.*, page 37.)

The third great field of Apostolic Tradition lies among *practical* matters, the *Discipline, Formularies,* and

(Eastern Orthodox)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

partly from Ecclesiastical Tradition, and the doctrines of Councils and of the Holy Fathers. . . . The Precepts of the Church are of two kinds, the one committed to writing, which are contained in the Divine books of sacred Scripture, the other delivered from the Apostles by Word of Mouth. These are the same which the Councils and holy Fathers did afterwards more at large declare.

Contents:

(Kritopoulos, 1625.)

The Traditions are concerned with the rites of the Holy Sacraments, and with certain other things which are both useful and adorn the Church. For the Holy Scripture does enjoin the observance of the Sacraments, but it does not say how and in what manner they are to be celebrated. But the Church, moved by the Holy Spirit, prescribes the manner.

(Kritopoulos, 1625.)

The chief Traditions of the Primitive Church are . . . the veneration of sacred images and sacred relics;

(Tractarian)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

Rites of the Church of Christ; in regard of which, reason tells us, that the Church Apostolical must here have had *some* method and system; yet it is evident to the very eye that the New Testament exhibits no such system in form, but only fragments and other indications of one in full operation at the time, and well-known to those for whom the Apostles were writing.

Contents:

(Pusey, Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, 1839, page 41.)

As to the *subjects* comprehended in the traditions acknowledged by the Church . . .

(1) The number and names of the authors of books divine and canonical,

(2) the summary of the chief heads of Christian doctrine contained in the Apostles' Creed,

(3) (fundamentals of Christian doctrine) whence it was enabled to expand the Apostles' Creed into the Nicene and Athanasian,

(4) "Rites not expressly contained in Scripture, though

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

the invocation of Saints; the observance of the forty days' fast before Easter, as also that of the fourth and sixth day of each week throughout the year; the monastic order; prayer for those who have fallen asleep; prayer toward the East; the refraining from kneeling (while at prayer) on Sundays and through the whole of Pentecost.

(Resenski's Russian Catechism, 1718.)

* By the name Holy Tradition is meant the Doctrine of the Faith, the Law of God, the Sacraments, and the ritual as handed down by the true believers and worshippers of God by word and example from one to another, and from generation to generation.

(TRACTARIAN)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

the grounds, reasons, or causes of their necessity, or benefit are; as Infant Baptism."

(5) The particular application of things generally ordained; "of this sort, many think, the observation of the Lenten fast, the fast of the fourth and sixth days of the week, and some others."

[In the above extract Pusey depends on Dean Field, *Of the Church,* from which also the sections in quotation marks are taken.]

(Keble, *Primitive Tradition,* 1836, pages 32 f.)

Not a few fragments yet remain . . . of the unwritten teaching of the first age of the Church. The paramount authority, for example, of the successors of the Apostles in Church government; the threefold order established from the beginning; the virtue of the blessed Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice; infant baptism; and above all, the Catholic doctrine of the most Holy Trinity as contained in the Nicene Creed. All these, however surely confirmed from

(EASTERN ORTHODOX)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

Relation to Scripture:

(Patriarch Jeremiah, Answer I, 575.)

* We cannot, relying on our own exegesis, consider or expound or interpret the meaning of the words of inspired Scripture other than according to the theologians approved for their pious purview by the Holy Synods in the Holy Spirit.

(The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox-Catholic Eastern Church, 1823, Russian.)

* We must follow that tradition which agrees with the Divine Revelation and with Holy Scripture, as is taught us by Scripture itself. . . . As a guide to the right understanding of Holy Scripture, for the right ministrations of the Sacraments, and the preservation of sacred rites and ceremonies in the purity of their original institution.

(TRACTARIAN)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

Scripture, are yet ascertainable parts of the primitive unwritten system of which we yet enjoy the benefit.

Relation to Scripture:

(Newman, *Prophetical Office of the Church,* 1837, page 349.)

We do not discard the tradition of the Fathers; we accept it. . . . It witnesses to its own inferiority to Scripture.

(Keble, *Primitive Tradition,* 1836, page 74.)

The English Church . . . acknowledging Scripture as her written charter, and Tradition as the common law whereby both the validity and the practical meaning of that charter is ascertained, venerates both as inseparable members of one great providential system: without confounding their provinces or opposing them to each other.

(Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 1842, 3d edition, pages 34-35.)

The doctrine or tradition of Christians in all ages, *i.e.,* of the catholic church,

(TRACTARIAN)

PRIMITIVE TRADITION
(Continued)

is presented to us as a confirmation of the true meaning of Scripture. . . . That doctrine which claims to be deduced from Scripture, and which all Christians believed from the beginning, must be truly scriptural. . . . The difference between the Anglo-catholic and the Romish doctrine of tradition is this: the former only admits tradition as confirmatory of the true meaning of Scripture, the latter asserts that it is also *supplementary* to Scripture, conveying doctrines which Scripture has omitted.

(Pusey, Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, p. 40.)

Rome differs from us as to the authority which she ascribes to tradition; she regards it as *co*ordinate, our divines as *sub*ordinate; as to the *way in which it is to be employed* she, as independent of Holy Scripture, ours, as subservient to, and blended with, it.

Chapter III.

THE EARLY TRACTARIANS AND REUNION

The desire on the part of the Tractarians for Reunion was natural because the Church of England in her isolation had become a reproach unto her neighbours[1] and was unable to assume her lawful place in the family of Christendom. The desire was present in all, however differently interpreted was the actual estrangement, and however varied the methods suggested for overcoming that separation.

But such differences did exist. There was first of all Deacon Palmer, who considered the division to be more apparent than real, and proceeded to act upon that assumption.[2] Then there was the view represented by William Palmer of Worcester College, who, while admitting and lamenting the fact of actual disunity, was chiefly concerned to prove that the Church of

[1] *E.g.*, W. G. Ward, esp. in his *Ideal of a Christian Church*, 1844, pp. 122-124.

[2] See Chapter II, pp. 20-21; and Chapter V, on "The Palmer Episode."

England herself was not guilty of wilful separation from the Catholic Church.[3] At the other extreme was W. G. Ward, who refused to believe that the Church of England was not in schism, contending rather that she was, and that she wished for nothing different.[4]

Where the ideal of Reunion prevails it is concerned with "Catholic Reunion" rather than that of all Christians; that is to say, it is limited by the general Tractarian Theory of the Church. There is in consequence opposition to all the forms, and to the principle itself, of Protestantism. The work of the Reformation, though appreciated to some extent by the more conservative leaders such as Palmer and Hook, is on the whole undervalued; while men like Hurrell Froude, Ward, and Deacon Palmer are disposed to repudiate it altogether. And in general, the Tractarians were averse to consorting with any of the Reformed Churches.

---

[3] W. Palmer, *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches Vindicated Against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman in the Dublin Review,* 1840, p. 188: "We positively deny that we ever separated ourselves from the communion of the eastern or the western churches or that we refuse them communion at the present day." So in his *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Ch. x, Sec. ii, pp. 176-177: "The Church of England never did at any time, by any voluntary act whatever, separate herself from the communion of the universal Church"; and he challenges opponents to "name any English synod, any article, any authentic document" that would prove the contrary.

[4] W. G. Ward, *Ideal of a Christian Church,* pp. 120, 122.

One reason, and in the case of Newman the main one, for the outcry against the proposed Jerusalem Bishopric, was precisely this prospect of Anglicans' associating with German Protestants.[5]

But if there was disagreement in their ideas regarding foreign Protestants, in their views of English Dissent there was none. There is scarcely a sympathetic word for the non-Episcopal bodies in England, or a wish expressed for an understanding with them. Such union as may be suggested is as insistent on submission on the part of Dissent as is the Roman requirement in the case of Anglicans. Dissent is wholly outside the pale.[6] "There is not a dissenter living but, inasmuch, and so far as he dissents, he is in a sin." [7] That being so, there could be no Reunion on a mutual basis between the Church of England and any form of Dissent, English or foreign. Reunion on terms of equality would be thought of as possible only in connection with Rome and with the Orthodox East.

---

[5] See Chapter IV, on "The Jerusalem Bishopric." For W. Palmer's view referred to above, *cp. Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. xii on "The Foreign Reformation" (pp. 276-305); Vol. II, pp. 45, 89, 62.

[6] A similar attitude is maintained, though not with the same bitterness, against Eastern heretical bodies. *Cp.* Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. xiv ("Of the Nestorians and Monophysites").

[7] J. H. Newman, *Parochial Sermons,* Vol. III, p. 220 (Sermon on "Submission to Church Authority," 1836).

I. The Controversy with Rome.

To oppose Rome was one of the aims of the Tractarian Movement in its beginnings. "It began in a spirit of the most loyal Anglicanism evoked by the successful attacks of the Protestant secretaries and the Roman Catholics, aided by a Liberalist Government, upon the Established Church; it proceeded, up to a certain point, in a spirit of resolute hostility to Popery no less than to Sectarianism." [8] This testimony is from the most extreme anti-Protestant of the group, Deacon Palmer, of Magdalen College; and it could be supplemented by similar utterances from the works of Early Tractarians of all shades of opinion.[9] The controversy, however, did not involve opposition to all things Roman: there were points of agreement as well as of difference.

i. Points of Agreement.

Rome was ever in their thoughts, whether as friend or as foe. Excepting their rejection of the Papacy and such innovations as could be traced to the Papal system, the Tractarians' outlook was Romeward, as witness both the secessions from Anglicanism and the early need

[8] Deacon Palmer, Letter to Khomiakoff, June 4, 1845 (in W. J. Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 22).

[9] *Cp.* W. Palmer, *Narrative of Events*, etc., esp. Chapter iii.

of defence against the charge of Romanizing. They were agreed that Rome was part of the Church of Christ, and that some peculiarly Roman doctrines were not on that account necessarily to be rejected.

1. The Catholicity of Rome

In keeping with the Branch Theory they asserted that Rome was a true Church, though there are indications that in the early stages of the Movement they were not equally alive to all that Rome was or intended. On this Roman question, however, there were differences, represented respectively by the two sections of Tractarianism. Ward from the first was attracted by everything Roman, and only stayed in the English Church to accelerate her path toward Rome.[10] Froude's attitude was similar, but suffered somewhat from the check it had received when he visited Rome.[11] Newman's heart was soothed by the Roman Church.[12] Keble is exceedingly tender, pleading for sympathy with, or at least neutrality toward, that communion.[13] Even Pusey was accused, and not

---

[10] W. Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement,* Chapter vii, "A New Current in the Movement, 1838-1841."

[11] Froude's *Remains,* Part I, Vol. I, 1838, pp. 306-308.

[12] *Lyra Apostolica,* clxxiv.

[13] John Keble, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel,* edited by R. F. Wilson, 1870: *Letter to a Young Layman,* written between 1840 and 1850. Pages 78-79.

by enemies alone, of palliating the Church of Rome.[14]

But, on the other hand, the convinced Anglican section is less and less disposed to show such consideration. They would have been more inclined to assent to the view of the *Churchman's Manual,* that Rome is "an unsound and corrupt Branch of the Christian Church" and that the proper conduct toward her is "to pray God to restore her to . . . soundness of faith and doctrine."[15] Rome's foremost opponent was Palmer of Worcester, whose antipathy to that Church was evidently an obsession, for he never hesitated to give expression[16] to it; while in his *Letters to Wiseman* he allows these anti-Roman sentiments to outstep the bounds of courtesy and fairness. To him, therefore, the

[14] *Life of Pusey,* ii, 295. Letter of W. F. Hook to Pusey, January 31, 1842: "I do wish you and Newman would just point out to us what is your standing point—the position you have decided to take. At present the whole system seems so nearly that of attacking the Church of England and palliating the Church of Rome."

Ibid., ii, 454, Manning's Letter to Pusey, August 8, 1845: ". . . We owe to the Church of Rome a pure Christian charity as to a member of the Catholic body: we owe the same also to the Churches of the East. I do not find you expressing the latter feeling, and that seems to me the cause why you are misunderstood to have not a charity to the whole Body of Christ, but a partial fondness and leaning to the Roman Church."

[15] *The Churchman's Manual,* 1st ed., 1834, Questions 72 and 73. Probably the work of A. P. Perceval, who has much more to say along these lines, *e.g.,* in his *Historical Notices Concerning Some of the Peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome,* 1836.

[16] F. Oakeley, *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement,* 1865, p. 36 f.

Church of Rome is a corrupt Church, but he agrees that it is still a part of the Church of Christ in spite of its glaring imperfections.[17]

2. Doctrinal Symbols

As to doctrines, it is pointed out that the Church of England shares with the Roman the Apostles' Creed, as also the Nicene Creed, including the *Filioque* addition which was inherited from Rome.

3. Sacramental System

Besides all this there is the high Sacramentalism, and that general approach to the entire Roman system which found expression in Tract 90. The tendency among many was, in fact, to accept the whole of pre-Tridentine theology, and to balk only at the definitions of the Council of Trent. Newman himself did not hold the doctrine of Transubstantiation till after his submission to the Roman Church,[18] but when Tract 90 appeared, Ward was quick to interpret it "on the Roman side," and went on to maintain the right to profess and to teach all Roman doctrine while yet retaining his position in the Church of England.[19] And Froude, as early as 1835, had protested against Keble's

[17] W. Palmer, *Treatise on the Church,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Chapter xi: "On the Churches of the Roman Obedience."

[18] *Apologia,* Part VII.

[19] Pusey, Preface to Tract 90, 1865, page xix. See also Palmer's general protest in his *Narrative of Events,* etc., 1843.

shrinking from teaching what amounted to Transubstantiation, though Froude himself was opposed to the dogma, as such, because it was an attempt to define what was meant to be a mystery.[20] There was some reason, therefore, for the outcry when Tract 90 appeared, since it was becoming evident that some at least of the Tractarians were inclined to adopt the whole cycle of Roman doctrine, while maintaining at the same time that they did not cease thereby to be members of the Anglican Church.

ii. Points of Conflict.

It is possible that Tractarian opposition to Rome was in part based on sentiment. These men, having been brought up in the Church of England, had in most cases formed an attachment for that communion, such as rendered them unwilling to do anything seemingly derogatory to her. But even so, there were elements in the Roman system alien to their theology.

1. The Pretensions of the Papacy

The Pretensions of the Papacy is a subject to which they keep reverting, as do the theologians of the East. Newman, being better able to see the relation of the Papal question to the entire Roman controversy, found it less alarm-

[20] Froude's *Remains,* Part II, Vol. I, p. 146. The passage is quoted below.

ing on that account.[21] But the other leaders were more sensitive. Says Perceval, "We never separated from the Church of Rome. The usurped, unwarranted, and imperious supremacy of the Bishop of that Church we did . . . refuse to acknowledge." [22] And there is much to this effect in Tractarian writings generally. The objection is to the supreme authority of the Pope as insisted upon by the Roman theory. Otherwise the Anglo-Catholics would have been ready to admit—as the East has been willing to do—that the Bishop of Rome is first in point of rank, though not in authority over his brethren.

2. The Inflexible Demands of Rome

That Rome was inflexible in her demands had not been clearly realized at the first. Newman and Froude, for instance, seem to have been completely taken back on the occasion of their visit to Wiseman in Rome. It came as an astounding revelation to them: "We found to our dismay that not one step could be gained without swallowing the Council of Trent as a whole." [23] This discovery was painful to those who cherished affection for Rome. The rebuff was felt to be cruel:

[21] *Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* page 8.
[22] A. P. Perceval, *A Christian Peace Offering,* 1829, p. 158.
[23] Froude's *Remains,* Part I, 1838, Vol. I, pp. 306-308.

"O Mother Church of Rome, why has thy heart
Beat so untruly towards thy northern child?
. . . Thou cruel-natured Rome!" [24]

"O that Rome were not Rome! But I seem to see as clearly as day that a union with her *is impossible*. She is the cruel Church, asking of us impossibilities, excommunicating us for disobedience, and now watching and exulting over our approaching overthrow." [25]

But to those in the movement who lacked that tenderness, the Roman attitude was simply an insolent demand: "The Romanists . . . claim of us a subjection to the see of Rome which cannot be proved due by the laws of the Universal Church." [26] The Tractarian protest was because Rome insisted on complete submission, which involved the surrender of the entire Anglican position, Tractarian or other; and that again meant the abandonment of the Branch Theory, thus virtually excommunicating also the Churches of the East.

3. Irregular Definitions of the Faith

Again, Rome was opposed because at Trent, which was not considered an Oecumenical Council except by Rome herself, she had proceeded to formulate doctrine. The Tractarians are on the

[24] Newman, *Lyra Apostolica,* clxxiii, "The Cruel Church," 1833.
[25] *Letters and Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* Vol. I, p. 338, 1898 ed. (Letter to his sister Jemima, April 11, 1833, from Naples.)
[26] Charles Marriott, *Lecture at the Diocesan College,* Chichester, 1840, page 17.

whole strongly critical of dogmas peculiar to Rome. So long as these remained undefined they could be thought of as allowable. The same is true of the veneration of images and the invocation of saints, as these were observed in the pre-Reformation period. The Tractarians, though opposed to these practices, were nevertheless prepared to tolerate them because they believed that up to the time of the Reformation there had been no final pronouncement upon them by a Council representing the whole Church. Thus Palmer could argue that the pre-Reformation Church was "part of Christ's Church, though a corrupt one; because there had been no *definition of errors, and no imposition of idolatries,* by any authority to which every member of the Church was bound to submit his own judgment." [27]

And not only was there objection to the fact of irregular definition, but also to the very spirit which desired so to define what the general sense of the Undivided Church had been content to leave in mystery. Thus Froude, who, while admitting a Eucharistic change, objects to the "erroneous . . . Roman Catholic dogma about Transubstantiation. Unlike the Protes-

[27] W. Palmer, *Letters to Wiseman,* I, 1841, pp. 42-43. For the Tractarians' view of the Seventh Council, see below in this chapter.

tant glosses, this does not attempt to explain away everything miraculous in the history of the Last Supper; but, by explaining precisely wherein the miracle consisted, and how it was brought about, it aims, like them, at relieving us from a confession of ignorance, and so far must be regarded as a contrivance of human scepticism, to elude the claims of Faith, and to withdraw from the hidden mysteries of religion the indistinctness in which God has thought fit to envelop them." [28]

4. Peculiarities of the Roman Cultus

To the conservative section of Tractarianism certain distinctive Roman customs were anathema. Palmer indicates the following as errors of Romanism: the Roman doctrine of satisfactions, with the whole system of penance which it involves;[29] the belief in Purgatory;[30] the dogmatic teaching on Transubstantiation;[31] the adoration and invocation of the Virgin,[32] of saints,[33] and of angels;[34] the veneration of im-

[28] Froude's *Remains,* Part II, Vol. I, p. 146 (In "Essay on Rationalism").

[29] *Letters to Wiseman,* III, 1841: the letter as a whole.

[30] *Letters to Wiseman,* VI, 1841. Also *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. xi, p. 274.

[31] *Treatise on the Church,* Vol. I, Pt. II, Ch. vii; Vol. II, pp. 399-406.

[32] *Treatise,* Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. xi, p. 273. *Letters to Wiseman,* V, 1841, pp. 73-75.

[33] *Treatise,* as in Note 32. *Letters to Wiseman,* V, pp. 75 ff.

[34] *Treatise,* as in Note 32.

ages,[35] and of relics.[36] Pusey generally agrees with Palmer, but his chief objection is to the adoration of the saints and of the Virgin.[37]

In this attack on the worship of Virgin and saints both Palmer and Pusey exhibit weakness. To the latter Newman replied, showing that if Rome was in the wrong on that issue, the East was no less in error.[38] And Newman's line of argument had been anticipated, by more than twenty years, in connection with the controversy with Wiseman. Palmer, in attacking the Roman practice, had cited Primitive authorities as showing the adverse judgment of the ancient Church. He was anonymously answered by a writer on the Roman side, who was able to prove from authoritative Eastern sources that "whatever is offensive to Protestants in our devotions, may be found in those of the Greek schismatics, and that, too, in a form even still more revolting." [39]

But it may be questioned whether the opposition to these practices is always sincere or

---

[35] *Letters to Wiseman,* I, p. 44.

[36] *Treatise,* as in Note 32.

[37] Pusey, *Eirenicon I,* 1865, pp. 99-190.

[38] Newman, *Letter to . . . Pusey, on His Recent Eirenicon,* 1866, pp. 95-96.

[39] *The Character of . . . W. Palmer of Worcester College as a Controversialist,* 1843, page 62. The authorship is generally ascribed to Peter le Page Renouf.

consistent. Palmer, for instance, sees that the worship of images or pictures in the Eastern Church among the common people does approach to idolatry, because they do not distinguish between the *latreia* due to God alone, and the veneration or inferior worship allowed as regards sacred images. But he is fain to excuse the Greek Church as a whole: "they maintain that divine worship is only due to God," and therefore that Church is not to be charged with formal idolatry.[40] But so does the Church of Rome.[41] So that whereas Palmer seeks extenuation for image-worship in the Greek Church, when writing to Wiseman he makes no similar concessions, but holds the Church of Rome is idolatrous because of a practice for which, in the former connection, he welcomes an excuse.

5. The Roman Schism in England

One of the most damaging answers to the Tractarian Theory was the presence of the Roman Church in territory deemed to be Anglican. It was clear that not only was the Theory rejected by one of the three Branches of the Church, but that this same was challenging the

[40] Palmer, *Treatise on the Church*, 3d ed., Vol. I, Part I, Ch. ix, p. 171.

[41] See Adrian Fortescue, *Catholic Encyclopaedia*, article "Images." He there gives the decision of the Second Nicene Council, and adds: "That is still the standpoint of the Catholic Church. . . . Nothing has since been added to that definition."

right of Anglicanism to exist even in its own home.

Now it was a necessity of the Branch Theory to insist that the Anglican was the one lawful Branch in England. It could be argued on the other side that for centuries the Papal connection had been accepted, and that at the Reformation the English Church broke away from a bond of long duration. But Tractarians vehemently denied that in so doing the Church of England had broken away from the unity of the Church Universal. Granting the truth of their contention, it followed that there could be only one lawful Church in this region. That being the case, either the Church of England, or the Church of Rome in England, was in schism: both could not be members of the one Catholic Church.

A great deal, therefore, is said by Palmer[42] and others on the schismatical Roman Communion. The stand was taken that Rome was an intruder intent on defying Anglicanism in its proper territory. Both on the Roman and the Tractarian side this meant war, and the Tractarians, particularly of the "Anglican" section, did not shrink from the conflict. But the war

[42] W. Palmer, *Apostolical Jurisdiction . . . of the Episcopacy in the British Churches Vindicated,* 1840, pp. 241 ff.

was carried on with vigour on the other side also. The *Dublin Review* did not spare, and through it Wiseman proceeded to undermine the Anglo-Catholic position by his suggestion of a parallel between the Church of England and the Donatists.[43]

II. The Appeal of the Eastern Church.

Since the failure of the non-Juror negotiations there had been practically no intercourse with the East, but instead a century of silence when each section kept to itself, little conscious of the existence of the other. In fact, not only in religion, but in other respects as well, was intercourse with Orthodox lands infrequent during that period. Certain links, however, did exist. There was the connection through the Ionian Islands, though that was scarcely powerful enough to bring the Orthodox Church sufficiently within the ken of the British people.[44] The awakening of the Missionary spirit in the Evangelical Communions would lead them to take an interest in the recently organized work of the American Protestant Churches in the Levant. During the early years of the Oxford

[43] Church, *Oxford Movement,* Chapter xii. *Apologia,* Part V.

[44] *Cp.* the surprise of Froude and Newman during their Mediterranean voyage in 1833 regarding many Orthodox customs. See Letters of Newman, and Froude's *Remains,* with reference to this period.

Movement the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was manifesting special interest in the same region, and even sent representatives with offers of help to the Eastern Churches. About the same time the Church Missionary Society sent agents into Greek Orthodox territory, a move which caused friction between that Society and the Anglo-Catholic party in England. There had been travelers, such as Curzon, Pinkerton, and Beaven,[45] the accounts of whose travels dealt largely with the Churches of the Near East. Moreover, toward the beginning of the nineteenth century the fact of Greece, thanks to poets and other Philhellenes, as well as because of the political situation in Europe, had come to be increasingly appreciated.[46]

i. The Revival of Interest in the East.

From the foregoing it is evident that the period under consideration was the beginning of a new era in the relations of the two Churches. But the purpose of the present dis-

[45] James Beaven was especially likely to catch the ear of the Tractarians. His work on *Intercourse between the Church of England and the Churches of the East,* 1840, first appeared (in part) in the form of letters to the *British Magazine,* 1839.

[46] In 1838 the Greek Community in London revived after a lapse of about 150 years. A chapel was opened, and an Orthodox pastor appointed. See Th. E. Dowling, *Hellenism in England,* page 86.

cussion more particularly is to note the place of Tractarianism in that development.

Not only the facts mentioned above, but also the Tractarian Theory of the Church, tended to promote intelligent enquiry into the nature of Christianity in the Orient;[47] for the Catholic world was held to exist in three Branches, of which the Eastern was one. Again, it was desirable to seek friendly relations therewith, since that would have removed from the Church of England the reproach of isolation. Furthermore, it was natural that these two Churches should draw together, seeing that Rome excommunicated both alike, and that they in their turn agreed in rejecting the Papal claim of Supremacy.

1. The Study of the Eastern Church

But the study of the Eastern Church was an interest comparatively recent. Some Early Tractarian writings suggest complete indifference, and seem content to take into account only Rome and the Church of England. And besides poverty of allusion, there are instances of insufficient familiarity with the subject, such as longer application to this study was sure to correct. It is surprising to find Palmer saying that

[47] In Palmer's *Treatise on the Church* there is a section devoted to the Oriental Churches: Vol. I, Chapter ix.

the Apostles' Creed and the *Te Deum* are used in the Eastern Church.[48] It is still more remarkable that Pusey should be declaiming against standing at the Eucharist and at prayer, as contrary to the practice of the whole Church, forgetting that such in each case is the practice of the East.[49]

Newman in this connection differs from the rest by being critical rather than indifferent. The two aspects in which his relation to the subject is peculiar to himself and significant are (i) his disinclination to accept the Seven Oecumenical Councils as sufficient, and (ii) his believing that the Pope had exerted authority over the Greeks. By 1841 he had become convinced of the heretical character of Protestant

Newman

---

[48] Palmer, *Treatise,* etc., Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. vii, p. 121.

[49] Pusey, *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury,* 2d ed., 1842, p. 117. This was in connection with his protest against the Jerusalem Bishopric. The protest was partly because the Bishopric was a bringing together persons "one knows not whom, sound and unsound . . . who never kneel in the public worship of God, sitting when they sing their hymns, standing to receive the Holy Eucharist." Again, in "Notes added to the Third Edition" of said letter, 1842, p. 5, he refers in the same connection with horror to the Lutheran custom of standing to receive the Holy Communion: "The Lutheran attitude of receiving IT . . . as it is unexampled (the writer believes) elsewhere, so it has not the semblance of plea, which the Calvinist put forth for his position of sitting. Both are inventions of men." Compare with this: Canon XX of Nicaea I: "On Lord's days and at Pentecost all must pray standing and not kneeling" (Ancient epitome of the Canon).

doctrines, such as those bearing on Justification and on the nature of the Sacraments; but when he looked to the Oecumenical Councils for support, he found there no explicit declaration that these were heresies. Writing to Keble, he says: "Nay, who can answer for himself what he would think of our Church were a heretical note upon it? . . . And then . . . what *is* heresy? Is the Protestant doctrine of justification? Is the denial of the Real Presence? Or the denial of Episcopal grace, or of the Catholic Church?" [50] The editors of the *Correspondence* add the comment: "Newman's difficulty in finding a definition of heresy which would include the doctrines of Protestantism arose from the fact that these doctrines had not, of course, been condemned by any General Council to which he as an Anglican could appeal." [51] But the Anglican was not the only Church without an authoritative pronouncement of this sort. The Orthodox Church, which had no Council of Trent to its credit and could appeal only to the Oecumenical Seven, was much in the same position. The peculiar note of authority he sought he might find, as he ultimately believed he did, within the Church of Rome; and to the

[50] *Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* p. 139 (Letter, Sept. 4, 1841).

[51] *Ibid.,* p. 139.

extent that he moved in that direction, he would be disposed to exclude the Greek Church, no less than the Anglican, from the sphere of Catholicity.

His attitude toward that communion was further affected by the discoveries he believed he had made regarding Rome's successes over the East. In his inquiry into the Arian dispute he was impressed by this very fact: "I found what surprised me very much. . . . I found the Eastern Church under the superintendence (as I may call it) of Pope Leo. I found that *he* made the Fathers of the Council unsay their decree and pass another, so that (humanly speaking) we owe it to Pope Leo at this day that the Catholic Church holds the true doctrine." [52]

But even if Newman's judgment was less sympathetic than could be desired, it serves to show that generally the Eastern Church had ceased to be a matter of indifference, and was beginning to receive proper consideration by the leaders of the Oxford Movement.[53]

With the Eastern Church thus variously brought into the consciousness of the Trac-

---

[52] *Correspondence of J. H. Newman*, p. 24 (Extract from a letter to a friend, April 5, 1844).

[53] *Cp., e. g.*, Palmer's *Treatise on the Church.*

tarians, some understanding would be hoped for, both for reasons of self-vindication and self-preservation, and because there was a genuine desire for Reunion. But no general, definite overtures were made to bring this about. The nearest approach to this, fruitful in results of a kind, was the self-appointed mission of Deacon Palmer to Russia.[54] The Early Tractarians were too preoccupied with safeguarding the position of the Church of England to engage in extensive Reunion activities.

2. Steps Toward Reunion

The Eastward Movement would naturally vary according to the particular School of Tractarianism. To the Romanizing section it would make no appeal, since any approach to the East would be a likely hindrance to a union more desired. The most outspoken utterance along these lines is in the *British Critic* for July, 1841:

"Our natural affections would, of course, guide us in the first place to an union with Rome; the mother by whom our spiritual infancy was nursed; the Church from which we have been most recently and most violently severed. We should love—could we order all things according to our pleasure—first to wipe out the memory of past unkindnesses with her; to explain the mutual misunderstandings from which our differences

[54] Discussed in Chapter V below.

arose; and to renew the endearing connection which bound us to her, in those early days when the missionaries of her first and holiest Gregory administered the holy mysteries to our Anglo-Saxon forefathers. . . .

"With our ancient mother, then, we cannot renew our connection without such an arrangement as, by meeting this difficulty, shall include in its provisions her oriental sister. And, on the other hand, an arrangement with the Eastern Patriarchates while we continue in severance from Rome—though it is, in appearance, more probable than the other; and though it is our clear duty to reunite ourselves, if the opportunity be offered, with any orthodox branch of the holy Catholic Church—would not only seem like the abandonment of our nearest relative for a more distant connection, but would, by increasing to a very great extent the grounds of contention between Rome and England which now exist, tend, in a proportional degree, to perpetuate a schism which, as more unnatural, is still more to be deplored than the severance of the two languages, so to call them, of the Church—the Greek and Latin Communions." [55]

But most of the Tractarians felt otherwise. We are assured that Keble "had invincible objections to the Latin and Greek branches," [56]

---

[55] *British Critic,* July, 1841, pp. 135-163, article on "The Anglican Church in the Mediterranean." The author, according to a note in an unpublished letter of Newman's, was J. W. Bowden. For this information the writer is indebted to Father Francis Bacchus of the Oratory, Birmingham, England.

[56] J. T. Coleridge, *Memoir of Keble,* 3d ed., p. 441.

but they were not so strong as to make him blind to the actual situation. For he not only held the East to be one of the Branches of Catholicism, but also claimed kinship with it, as, for example, in having an identical theory of the Church.[57] He saw, moreover, the importance of the *Filioque* controversy, and had a suggestion to make whereby the difficulty could be overcome and the interrupted fellowship restored.[58]

Keble

Palmer of Worcester College is less pronounced on the subject. One reason for this may be that his Theory assumes the existence of a unity which, however, is not borne out by facts. That he desires Reunion in some way is evident from his satisfaction in recording the relations of Cyril Lucar with England, Dr. Isaac Basire's experiences in the Levant in the seventeenth century, and the friendly attitude at the time of the Patriarch Païsios of Jerusalem.[59] But the impression remains that his interest in Reunion is largely academic. It is perhaps not without significance that his name does not appear among the members of the Eastern Church Association at any time.

Palmer

[57] Keble, *Sermons Academical,* 1847, Preface p. xxxvii.
[58] See next section in this chapter.
[59] W. Palmer, *Compendious Ecclesiastical History,* 1851, p. 321.

It is otherwise with Pusey, who was eager for the Reunion of the whole of Christendom, Eastern and Western, and was closely connected with the Eastern Church Association. As late as 1867, when he wrote the Introduction to the *Essays on Reunion,* he sought an agreement with the Eastern Church. But his hopes faded away before what he believed to be the aggressive attitude of the Russians;[60] and still more, at a later period, because of the extent of the doctrinal concessions which some Anglicans seemed willing to make to conciliate the East.[61]

Pusey

These misgivings are not in the *Eirenicon* of 1865. He could then still say, "the authorities of the great Russian Church (we hear, as sounds floating on the breeze) look favourably on the wish for restored communion." [62] There is much more in this strain, which, however, belongs more properly to the Sub-Tractarian period. But though not fully developed, his sentiments were similar during the earlier part of his life. In 1841 he writes: "Why should we . . . direct our eyes to the Western Church

[60] Liddon, *Life of Pusey,* Vol. iv, p. 293. See also, *re* 1840, Vol. ii, p. 149.

[61] See next section, on the *Filioque.*

[62] Pusey, *Eirenicon I,* 1865, p. 263.

alone, which, even if united in itself would yet remain sadly maimed, and sadly short of the Oneness she had in her best days, if she continued severed from the Eastern? After a long separation, in which we have not been known by name to the Eastern Church, much less our real character, God seems again to be opening to us ways of kindly intercourse, with some portions of her, which must increase love, which will also, under God's blessing, help her to restore the holiness and knowledge of her early years, and therewith make her wish to understand us better, and be united to us. All union of our distracted Christendom 'is impossible with man; with God' it is as 'possible' (and one may add it may be as likely to be His will) to unite His whole Church in one, at once, whenever His time may be, as any single portions of it." And he goes on to express the hope that the Visible Church, in all its Branches, will become "one fold under one Shepherd" . . . according to the heads of good Bishop Andrewes' daily intercession." [68] The same year he writes to B. Harrison: "It will come as a painful question to many, and to some be a difficulty as to our Church (as they come to see the perfect

[68] Pusey, *Letter to Dr. Jelf*, 1841, pp. 184-185. (Andrewes' prayer was "for the Church Catholic; Eastern; Western; our own.")

unity of Antiquity) why are we in communion with no other Church except our own sisters and daughters? We cannot have communion with Rome; why should we not with the *Orthodox* Greek Church? Would they reject us, or must we keep aloof?" [64]

Toward the end of the "Thirties" there was a move for a better understanding between the two Churches. In the letter to the Archbishop, Pusey speaks of the "Greek Communion which has just heard of us and is beginning to value us," [65] and he heartily shares in the hopes thus raised. He will not tolerate anything likely to dim the prospect of renewed intercourse. He strongly insists on the duty of non-interference with the Greek Church, and he is opposed to the Church Missionary Society because he believes it is not guiltless in this respect. "But any attempt at 'conversion' or connivance in persons forsaking the Orthodox Communion in which they were baptized, besides encouraging sin, must immeasurably delay the prospect of union with that communion. We ourselves know the bitterness of losing our own children, which a rival communion is stealing from us. Are we to think the sorrows of an-

[64] *Life of Pusey*, ii, 149 (Feb. 21, 1840).
[65] Pusey, *Letter to the Archbishop*, 2d ed., 1842, p. 115.

other Mother, when bereaved, less than our own? . . . We must either rigidly prescribe to ourselves our own bounds and remain with them, or give up the opening prospect of ultimate union. We cannot treat the Orthodox Greek Church as at once Orthodox and heterodox; Orthodox, in that we think union justifiable, heterodox, since heresy alone can justify secession. This reopened intercourse with the East is . . . a crisis in the history of our Church. It is a wave which may carry us onward, or, if we miss it, it may bruise us sorely and fall on us, instead of landing us on the shore. The union or disunion of the Church for centuries may depend on the wisdom with which this providential opening is employed." [66]

It must be admitted that the desire for Reunion on the part of these men is hesitating and undeveloped, but it is there none the less. In time, with increasing confidence and a better understanding of the issues involved, these small beginnings were bound to lead to a more determined effort to bring the two Churches together. And already it was being recognized that the hindrances in the way of renewed intercourse were theological, and that an attempt should be made to grapple with the problem.

[66] Pusey, *Letter to the Archbishop*, 2d ed., 1842, pp. 117-8.

ii. Dogmatic Difficulties.

The *Filioque* Clause and the Second Nicene Council constitute the chief theological issues between the Anglo-Catholics of that period and the Eastern Orthodox. But these dogmatic difficulties, though recognized as such, did not at first receive sufficient attention on the part of the Tractarians. This was because in their world at the time other issues were paramount. And, with reference to the former difficulty, a further reason would be that the *Filioque* was bound up with the entire Western heritage which they were not disposed to question. Not till after 1845 did it receive adequate treatment from some of their leaders.

1. The "Filioque" Clause

The two writers who have discussed the *Filioque* are Pusey and, to a lesser extent, Keble. To these must be added a third, though he is not strictly of the Tractarian party: William Palmer of Magdalen.

Pusey

Pusey's discussions on the Procession began to appear twenty years later than the period here dealt with, but he maintained that throughout those years his views had been consistent.[67]

[67] *Life of Pusey,* iv, 300. Private letter to Liddon, Feb. 8, 1876: "It has been my conviction for above forty years that since the Latins

As early as 1840 he had asked: "What should hinder communion from being restored with the Orthodox Greek Church? Does it seem that we need insist on their receiving the *Filioque,* or that they would not enter into communion with us because we retain it?" [68] "One should have hoped that they would have been glad to be re-united with a large Christian Church exterior to themselves, provided we need not insist upon their adopting the *Filioque.*" [69] The two things noticeable here are the spirit of wistfulness for Reunion, and at the same time a determination not to give up the Western form of the Creed. It also prepares the way for the compromise suggested in later years: "We ask nothing of them, in case of Reunion, but to go on as we are. We do not ask them to receive the *Filioque,* but only not to except against our expressing our belief in the way in which their own great writers, St. Epiphanius, St. Cyril, and others, did. . . . If ever there is to be an agreement, and we are not to be simply merged in the Greek Church and to embrace false doctrine, I am sure that this is the only way that they should . . . ac-

believed in the monarchia and the Greeks of old believed in the Eternal Procession through the Son, their beliefs must be the same."

[68] *Ibid.,* ii, 149 (Letter to Rev. R. Harrison, Feb. 21, 1840).

[69] *Ibid.,* ii, 149.

cept our rejection of the heresy which they impute to our formula and leave us in possession of it." [70]

What Pusey misses, not only in the earlier period but all along, is that the Eastern objection is not so much to the heretical nature of the clause—though much is said upon that point—as to the manner in which the clause was introduced into the Creed. He does indeed recognize that in the *Filioque* controversy there are two aspects which should be kept apart, *viz.*, the Orthodoxy of the words, and the lawfulness or otherwise of their insertion in the Creed;[71] but while repudiating with vigor and success the imputation of heresy as attaching to the words, he is not equally sensitive to the Eastern rejection of the clause on the ground of its being an unauthorized insertion.[72]

---

[70] *Life of Pusey,* Vol. iv, 295 (Letter to Liddon, Aug. 19, 1875).

[71] Pusey, *On the Clause "And the Son,"* 1876, p. 33.

[72] In his later writings Pusey argues that union with the East would be possible by means of mutual explanations and concessions, such as would prove the Orthodoxy of the West but would allow it to retain the *Filioque.* He is out of patience with the Easterns for their stressing the subject. He thinks the Anglican Church received the *Filioque* "not by any act of our own, but as circulated insensibly throughout the Latin Church" (*Eirenicon I,* 1865, pp. 263-4). But having once been received, it cannot be given up, because it has become essential to the correct expression of the faith of the West. Certain Anglicans at the Bonn Conference, 1875, seemed disposed to make too many concessions on the "Procession": Pusey was ready to forego reunion with the Greeks rather than give up the Clause.

The suggestion regarding the possibility of Reunion by means of mutual explanation and concession was anticipated by Keble. In 1851 he writes: "The more I think on the passages which I have seen (few indeed), the more I seem convinced that the difference is merely verbal. I grant that this makes greatly against Rome, in forming an opinion as to which of the parties was really most blameable for the separation. But surely it ought to take away the difficulty of joining in either formula which happened to be imposed on one by authority otherwise competent." [73] "May not *Filioque* be taken as meaning 'So proceeding from the Father as neither to damage, on the one hand, the Father's Prerogative as the sole fountain of the Godhead . . . nor, on the other hand, the Son's Prerogative as having, so to speak, the Holy Spirit for His own Spirit . . . as truly and entirely as It is the Father's?" [74] And that

Keble

For his later and maturer views on this entire subject, compare particularly:

Eirenicon, I, 1865.

Introduction to *Essays on Reunion,* 1867.

Preface to Philip Pusey's edition of *Cyril on St. John,* 1874.

On the Clause "And the Son," in Regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conference, 1876.

[73] Keble, Letter to a Clergyman, Jan. 31, 1851 (In *Studia Sacra,* 1877, pp. vii-viii).

[74] *Ibid.,* Letter to a Clergyman, Jan., 1852 (as above, p. ix).

this method should commend itself to him is not surprising, seeing he holds that in the dispute both Greeks and Latins are to blame: "The more I inquire, the more I seem to perceive that the two portions of the Church will probably be found to divide the blame—the Greeks wrong in charging the Latins with false theology, the Latins wrong in adding to the Creed without sufficient authority." [75]

From all this it will be seen that Keble, too, is attached to the *Filioque* and is determined not to give it up, and that he does not appreciate fully the nature of the Eastern objection to the clause.

Deacon Palmer

Deacon William Palmer of Magdalen, as a result of his endeavours to gain admission into the Russian Church, came to understand best the Eastern point of view on the Procession, and finally to make it his own. He declares that by 1840 he was in complete agreement with the Eastern Church on all points save this; by 1847 there was agreement on this also.[76] Moreover there is throughout his writings a

---

[75] *Ibid.*, same ref. as 73, page ix. In *Studia Sacra,* pp. 149-153, is a discussion on *Processio Spiritu Sancti.*

[76] Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church,* p. 178 (Palmer's Statement of Faith on his joining the Roman Church).

consistency in the interpretation of this difficulty and in the method suggested for overcoming it. He thinks that "the Eastern Church has all along been willing to drop the whole question of the sense of the Latin doctrine on the Procession, and to leave the Latins in full possession of their own opinion, and to communicate with them, if only they will consent to restore the Creed in its Ecumenical form" [77]: and in a Dissertation on "the Controversy respecting the Procession of the Holy Ghost" the doctrine is carefully analyzed, and the express statements as well as the implications of both Greeks and Latins are clearly set forth and a compromise suggested: "Such an exposition, supposing the Creed to be restored to its canonical form, might be accepted perhaps by the Easterns as an interpretation of the clause *Filioque* occurring in any other documents or writings of the Westerns, as for instance, in Article V of the XXXIX Articles of the Anglican Church: 'The Holy Ghost proceeding from the Father' (that is, from the Person of the Father only) 'And from the Son' (that is, from the substance of the Father which is now al-

[77] *Ibid.*, p. 49, Palmer's Letter to Khomiakoff, 1846. In the context he points out how this agrees with Cc. v-xi of the "Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of . . . the East," etc.

ready common to the Son, and numerically one in both)." [78]

This approach to the problem is found in many sections of the "Appeal to the Scottish Bishops," in the Correspondence with Khomiakoff, in the volume of Dissertations, and in the "Harmony of Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Doctrine." The same ideas are found in the account of conversations during the first visit to Russia (1840-1841): "I receive," he informed the Archpriest Koutnevich, "all that the Latin Fathers have said, no less than all that the Greek Fathers have said. . . . We cannot absolutely condemn the words 'And from the Son,' without condemning some of the Latin Fathers, which we are so far from doing that we rather, on the contrary, believe the Greeks to have agreed virtually with them, though they use a different form of speech. But as regards the mere question of form, we may confess that the Pope of Rome ought not to have altered, by any interpolation even of Orthodox words, the Creed of the Ecumenical Councils. And this at first the Pope himself, Leo III, said. The same Pope, however, allowed that the sense of the words was orthodox, and might be taught. We are far from requiring the

[78] *Dissertations on Subjects Relating to the Orthodox and Eastern Catholic Communion,* 1853, p. 162.

Greeks to insert the *Filioque;* and therefore I am ready to recite with them in their Churches the Creed without the addition." [79]

On another occasion, when he admitted that "the Greek terminology was that of the old Fathers," he was asked, "Why, then, do you not leave out the clause, and then there would no longer be any difference?" His reply to this was, "We must have some good reason for leaving out Orthodox words, even though they were improperly put in." [80] Two years later, on being told that before admission to the Russian Church he would have to anathematize certain theological propositions, the *Filioque* included, as false and heretical and as either found in or deducible from the XXXIX Articles,[81] he contended that there was a distinction of classes between the several propositions mentioned, and that the *Filioque* belonged to the first class, *viz.,* those "relating only to differences of phraseology or discipline or ritual." The *Filioque* is placed in that class on the ground "that the Westerns in our own time may lawfully use the expression *Filioque* as their Fathers in former ages, such as Ambrose, Augustine, and others, used it." [82]

[79] W. Palmer, *Notes of a Visit,* etc., p. 133-4. [80] *Ibid.,* p. 333.
[81] W. Palmer, *Appeal to the Scottish Bishops,* pp. 267-275.
[82] *Ibid.,* p. 277.

With the exception then of Deacon Palmer it may be said that the Early Tractarians did not appreciate fully the point of view of the East. They contended for the retention of a Symbol which, because of the interpolation, was not the Oecumenical one. They spent labour to prove the essential truth of the *Filioque,* and even its consistency with the teaching of the Greek Fathers, but they did not attempt to do as much to meet the main Orthodox objection. Deacon Palmer, though himself tenacious of the right to express his faith in the Western form, nevertheless saw that this right would need to be exercised in some connection other than the wording of the Creed which, he admitted, ought to be restored in the West to the Oecumenical form. The rest, however, rather than abandon the Western tradition which was part of their inheritance, seemed prepared to give up all prospect of reunion with the East. Much therefore had to be done, and much ground covered, before Tractarians could adequately appreciate the Eastern attitude on the question of the Procession.[83]

The second point in dispute relates to the Second Nicene Council (787 A.D.) which to

[83] For a discussion of the *Filioque* and of the Eastern attitude towards it, *cp.* F. Gavin, *Greek Orthodox Thought,* Milwaukee, U. S. A., 1923, esp. pp. 114-129, 136-143.

2. The Seventh Oecumenical Council

the Eastern Church bears a dogmatic significance. The Church of England lays stress on the first Four Councils, and the Tractarians, accepting these, have no difficulty about the Fifth and Sixth, since it is believed that their decisions are implied in those of the Four. In the Act of Elizabeth relating to the Church of England[84] the "First Four Councils" are referred to, "or in other words the consent of the Primitive Fathers of the first five centuries (is) made the rule, together with the Scriptures for determining heresy." [85]

Careful discussions defending the rejection of the Seventh Council are to be found in Pusey, and in William Palmer of Worcester College. Pusey shows that there is uncertainty as to the number of Oecumenical Councils: "They are Councils of the whole Church, *which have been subsequently received by the whole Church;* and of these there are but six; the seventh General Council which is received by the Greeks (the Deutero-Nicene Council) was formally rejected at the time in the Western Church." [86] Elsewhere, after referring to the Council of

[84] I Eliz., C. 1, Section 36.

[85] A. P. Perceval, *Observations on a Pamphlet entitled "Consensus Omnium,"* 1838, p. 19.

[86] Pusey, *Letter to Dr. Jelf,* 1841, p. 26.

Calchuythe, 785 A.D., at which the English Church formally received the Six Councils, he proceeds: "Our Church, shortly after . . . at the great Council of Frankfort rejected the Pseudo-synod of Nice, together with the Bishops of Germany and France. This has never been rescinded and the State recognizes Four specifically (of which the other two are supplements) and generally 'others' without defining them." [87]

Palmer devotes a long section in his *Treatise on the Church* to "the Synods of Constantinople and Nice in the Question of Images." [88] "The catholic church," he writes, "has never received or approved more than six synods as oecumenical," [89] and he goes on to show that this was the case even with Lutherans and other Reformers.[90] Further on he says: "We must also consider, that the Orientals imagine,

---

[87] Pusey, *Letter to the Bishop of Oxford,* 1839, p. 44, note. He refers to Palmer as his authority throughout.

[88] Palmer, *Treatise,* 3d ed., Vol. II, Pt. IV, Ch. x, Sec. iv.

[89] *Ibid.,* Vol. II, Pt. IV, Ch. ix, Introd. p. 128.

[90] *Ibid.,* p. 129. On this subject of II Nicaea, *cp.* Deacon William Palmer, in *Notes of a Visit,* etc., p. 117. He there relates an interview with Count Pratasoff: " 'As regards the decree of the Second Nicene Council,' I said, 'we reject it as did nearly all the West at the beginning.' 'No,' he objected, 'the Popes from the first received it, and still receive it.' 'Yes,' I replied, 'it was condemned in spite of their reception of it, all over Germany, France, and Britain; and as a matter of private opinion, I prefer the judgment of my own Church.' "

through a mistake in the question of fact, that the universal church enjoined the veneration of pictures in the second synod of Nice, which I shall prove . . . not to have been truly oecumenical, nor of any binding authority. But their mistake is founded on arguments of no inconsiderable weight." [91]

The acceptance of the Seven Councils, however, is believed in the East to be of the utmost importance. That the Oecumenical Councils are, and must be, seven in number, is always insisted upon;[92] and this, not only because the Seventh was truly Oecumenical, but particularly because of the doctrines involved in it. For in the last stage of the Iconoclastic Conflict of the eighth and ninth centuries the paramount considerations were theological, while other aspects which had figured prominently in earlier stages receded into the background. The embodiment of these theological considerations is in John of Damascus, whose writings present boldly and clearly the dogmatic aspect of the Conflict. The final stage of Iconoclasm was the last great struggle in defence of the Nicene

---

[91] W. Palmer, *Treatise,* 3d ed., Vol. I, Pt. I, Ch. ix, p. 171.

[92] See Chapter II. Also, J. A. Douglas, *Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Relations.* Appendix I. On the doctrinal significance of this Council, *cp.* Leighton Pullan, *The Christian Tradition,* 1902, pp. 212-215.

Faith. The acceptance of the reality of the Incarnation was a matter for which Oecumenical Christendom had striven for the past seven centuries. The Iconoclastic Movement had in the course of time come to be identified with the opposition to the Catholic teaching on the Person of Christ. To maintain the truth of the Humanity of Christ was now the great issue. The work of the Seventh Council was believed to have secured for all time, as a precious heritage of the Church, an adequate conception of the Human Nature of the Redeemer. The dispute as to the lawfulness of images, and more particularly those of Christ, had been felt to throw doubt upon the fact of the Incarnation and upon the true Humanity of our Lord.

Conclusion

Compared with the confidence and zeal of the Sub-Tractarians in seeking Reunion, the attitude of the earlier group may seem lacking in enthusiasm and decisiveness. But taken by itself, and in the light of all that preceded, it will be found to mark a definite advance. The conflict with Rome in which they were engaged showed them that union with that Church was out of the question, and that on the main points on which they differed from her—the Supremacy of the Pope and the irregular defining of

doctrine—they were at one with the East. A bond of sympathy would therefore arise, and an effort would be made to dispose of those remaining difficulties which were proving a hindrance to intercommunion.

Thus the trend of events conspired to foster the desire for an understanding. During the early years of the Oxford Movement many factors helped to bring to an end the long period of indifference. The re-awakened interest in the Eastern Church, the theoretic preconceptions of the Tractarian Revival, the sympathetic utterances of many Tractarians, the common peril from the renewed aggressiveness of Rome, all prepared the way for the greater activities of the next generation.

Chapter IV.

THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC

One of the most touching sections of the *Apologia* is where Newman, speaking of the Jerusalem Bishopric and of the crisis in his own life to which it led, concludes the story with these words: "As to the project of the Jerusalem Bishopric, I never heard any good or harm it has ever done, except what it has done for me; which many think a great misfortune, and I one of the greatest of mercies. It brought me on to the beginning of the end." [1] But to most of the Tractarians, and not to Newman alone, was this movement a stumbling block. And one of its effects was to reveal to themselves and to others the precise extent of their sympathy with the Eastern Church, and incidentally to make more evident the line of cleavage between the two wings of the party.

It will be necessary to consider the history of the founding of the Bishopric, before exam-

[1] *Apologia,* Part V, near the end.

ining the utterances of the Tractarians on the project.

I. Origins of the Bishopric.

The scheme originated in Prussia, and was due to the initiative of Frederick William IV, King of Prussia,[2] and of M. Bunsen. Frederick William IV was well-meaning but timid and irresolute. On his accession he was acclaimed as a Liberal, but he soon disappointed the hopes of his supporters. His religious convictions, however, were more consistent and tenacious than his political. He shared the Pietistic reaction which followed the Rationalism of the preceding century, and the devotional bent of his mind had for years directed his contemplation to the Holy Land, and had given him a desire to improve the condition of Christians in the Near East.

The other leading figure in the enterprise was Bunsen,[3] diplomat, author, theologian, and a man of genuine piety. Ever since the formation of their friendship in 1828, he had been wont to exchange confidences with Frederick

---

[2] Reigned 1840-1861.

[3] Christian Charles Josias, Baron von Bunsen, 1791-1860. In *Apologia,* Part V, Newman says, "I almost think I heard of the (Jerusalem) project when I was at Rome in 1833, at the hotel of the Prussian Minister, M. Bunsen."

William on religious matters. In 1841 he was sent by the King to England to negotiate the scheme with the British Government and the Anglican authorities. He was already familiar with the workings of the Vatican, and with the success attending the activities of so compact and perfect an organization, in contrast with the failures and difficulties of a divided Protestantism. A further characteristic, fitting him for his special mission, was his admiration for English institutions, and especially for the Anglican Church.

The general international situation, as also the ecclesiastical in Prussia and in Turkey, were responsible for the maturing of the scheme. In July 1841 a Treaty had been concluded[4] which checked the ambitions of Mehemet Ali[5] in Syria, and kept Russia from acquiring a paramount influence in Turkey. Syria, thanks largely to the exertions of Britain and Prussia, was now secured to the complete suzerainty of the Sultan of Turkey. Nevertheless the Russians still retained extensive influence through their claim to act as protectors of Orthodox Christians within the Ottoman Empire, as did the French through a similar rôle with reference to

[4] Treaty of London, 1841.
[5] Mehemet Ali, 1769-1849 (Pasha of Egypt, 1805-1849).

the Roman Catholic population. But Great Britain and Prussia were at a disadvantage, having no corresponding privileges in the same territory.

If the political situation in the Levant made desirable the establishing of a Bishopric there, the ecclesiastical situation in Prussia rendered expedient a closer connection with the Church of England. The year 1817 saw the formation of a new "National Church" called the "Evangelical Church of Prussia," which included the Lutherans and the Reformed, on a basis of compromise and comprehension. But it was felt that this State Church suffered from the absence of the Episcopate. The incompleteness, therefore, of that State System, as well as the advantages to be expected from its assimilation to that of the Church of England, led to an attempt, through coöperation with the Anglican Church, to introduce by degrees into Prussia the Historic Episcopate.[6]

---

[6] This was not the first instance of Lutherans in Prussia giving evidence of a sense of defect in their Church as compared with the Anglican. Circumstances had prevented at the Reformation the retention of the Episcopacy in Lutheranism. By many this was felt to be a misfortune, and special efforts were made from 1711 to 1713 (under Frederick I, 1701-1713), to bring the Prussian Church into line with the English. On that occasion, and again in order that Lutheran susceptibilities might not be irritated, it was proposed to begin by introducing first the English liturgy, in hopes that it would prepare the way for the Episcopate: a design nobly conceived and persisted in,

A further ecclesiastical difficulty to be considered was the unsatisfactory status of Protestants in Turkey. It should be borne in mind that, until quite recently, Turkey has known no nationality apart from religion. Non-Moslem peoples could not be incorporated into the Turkish nation, and were therefore treated as distinct national "groups," with the requirement that each group of the kind was to organize itself into a community. Such a community was known as a "millet," or "nation." There was the Roman "nation" (meaning the "Romaic" or Greek), which again was simply the Orthodox Church under the Patriarch of Constantinople. In the same way there was an Armenian millet, an Armenian-Catholic, and a Jewish one. As each "nation" was at the same time a particular religious body, the religious head came to be also the national leader, or the representative of it in dealings with the Porte.

In 1852 formal recognition was given to a Protestant Armenian millet, corresponding to the recently formed "Evangelical Church of the Armenians." This came into being after the

but which failed, largely through the inaction of Archbishop Tenison and his inability to appreciate the magnitude of the opportunity. Archbishop Sharp, of York, strongly supported that proposal. See *Life of Archbishop Sharp,* 1825, Vol. I, pp. 402-448.

Armenian Catholicos had anathematized all Armenians infected with Protestantism, and that it secured the status of "millet," in spite of opposition from France and Russia, was largely due to the energies of the British Ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, later Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe.[7] Such an arrangement, however, did not exist for other sections of Protestants, and certainly not for those already in Protestant congregations in Palestine, or yet to be gathered in by the Missions working there. But without organization for this purpose into one compact body, they could not expect recognition and adequate protection from the Turkish authorities.

II. The Project.

The project itself, though accelerated by the political and ecclesiastical situation indicated, was not of recent or sudden formation. It is not unlikely that it originated with Bunsen himself. Deacon Palmer relates that when in 1839 Bunsen was brought to his rooms in Oxford he said, among other things, that he had been making certain special recommendations to the King of Prussia. This was, explains Pal-

[7] For the position of Christians in Turkey in the nineteenth century, see *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia,* articles "Turkey"; "Armenia."

mer, to "apply to our (English) Bishops to consecrate Bishops for Prussia, even upon our own terms, Apostolical Bishops." Palmer replied, "We must take care first, that they themselves believe and accept the whole true Faith; and that, when consecrated, they will not extend our communion to others who reject any part of it." Then Bunsen said he proposed that the persons consecrated "should be required only to subscribe to 'the three Creeds': to which it was replied again, that there were many points beyond the letter of those Creeds, though more or less involved in their interpretation, which had been made matter of controversy by the 'Reformers' of the 16th century, and so grounds of their separation from the Roman-Catholic or Latin Church. . . . He said something also of an application to be made to the Eastern and the British Bishops jointly."[8] Three years earlier than this, Bunsen was known to be working for the introduction of Episcopacy into Prussia. This is shown by a letter of Bishop Patrick Torry's, dated 24th September 1836: "I have lately had a correspondence with Mr. Hook of Coventry . . . and he tells me that he has lately had a very gratifying visit

[8] W. Palmer, *Appeal to the Scottish Bishops,* Introduction, Part II, Section i, pp. cxix-cxx.

from a German doctor (of Divinity, I suppose) . . . The Doctor seems to be commissioned by the Prussian Government to enquire into the constitution and state of the Episcopal Churches of England, Scotland, and America, and seems to hint that it is the intention of government to introduce into its dominions a regular *Diocesan Episcopacy,* which you know they have not. And further, that they intend their first *consecration* to be performed by an *English,* a *Scotch,* and an *American* Bishop. . . . A Mr. Bunse (*sic*), who was tutor to the Crown Prince, over whom he has great influence, is the prime mover in all this." [9]

To this view Frederick William IV was won over, if he had not had it independently. Jerusalem, being removed from both Prussia and England, offered an advantageous position for the working out of this ecclesiastical experiment. The plan, moreover, fitted in with his design to bring about the organization of Protestant Christian forces in the Holy Land. On June 8, 1841 [10] the King requested Bunsen to sound the British authorities on the subject, and in the event of their agreeing to the found-

[9] J. M. Neale, *Life and Times of Patrick Torry, D.D.,* 1856, p. 165.

[10] W. H. Hechler, *The Jerusalem Bishopric,* 1883, Appendix, p. 2.

ing of the Bishopric expressed his readiness to endow it.[11] The proposal was not to found an "Anglo-Prussian" Bishopric, but an *Anglican Bishopric* at Jerusalem "to which individual *German flocks* and ministers might adhere without surrendering their nationality"; that is, "to erect an *English Bishopric* with *German congregations* attached to it."[12] The concessions asked for by Prussia were that the King should have alternately the right of nominating to the Bishopric, that German congregations should have their worship in the German tongue according to a liturgy to be drawn up from their ancient formularies and subject to the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, and that pastors of German congregations, to safeguard their orders being recognized as valid in case they returned to Prussia, should formally subscribe to the Augsburg Confession in addition to the Thirty-nine Articles.

III. The British Response.

Mr. Bunsen approached the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, the former as Primate, the latter as technically possessing jurisdiction over the foreign activities of the Church of England. The complaint on

[11] *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 46. [12] *Ibid.*, Appendix, p. 36.

the part of the opponents of the project was that the Church had had little time to consider the merits or demerits of it. The Archbishop himself is reported to have said [13] that he had been hurried by others more than he cared. On the other hand this much can be said for the supporters of the scheme: that the new conditions in Syria made a speedy agreement necessary, and that it had been submitted to the Bishops, none of whom is recorded to have raised an objection.[14]

The scheme became public in August, 1841. The Act of Parliament was passed on October 5th of the same year.[15] This Act authorized the Archbishop, either of Canterbury or of York, to consecrate British subjects, or subjects or citizens of foreign states, for work in foreign parts, with the proviso in the case of foreigners that they should not be required to take the customary oaths of allegiance, and that some of the formalities usual in episcopal consecrations should be dispensed with. In accordance with this Act, the Rev. Dr. Michael Solomon Alexander, a Jewish convert to Christianity and at this time Professor of Hebrew at King's Col-

[13] *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,* Vol. I, p. 289.

[14] Hechler, *op. cit., Fundamental Principles* (Appendix pp. 28 ff); *and Statement of Proceedings,* etc., in Hechler, 104 ff.

[15] Act: 5 Vict. Cap. 5 (In Hechler, Appendix, p. 48).

lege, London,[16] was consecrated Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem.

The official documents relating to this matter, and the Letters Commendatory given to the newly appointed Bishop, are important as revealing the general attitude of the Anglican Church toward Oriental Christianity. The Prussian document[17] dwells on the effect of the Bishopric on the Turkish Government and its relation to Evangelical Christians in Palestine, and scarcely refers to the Eastern Church at all. Not so the English "Statement of Proceedings" issued by the Archbishop of Canterbury,[18] where the main concern is the protection and welfare of that Church. In reviewing the possibilities of the Bishopric it is hoped that

". . . it may be the means of establishing relations of amity between the United Church of England and Ireland and the ancient Churches of the East, strength-

[16] M. S. Alexander, 1799-1845. Born in Prussia. Had strict Jewish upbringing. Came to England in 1820. Became a British subject. Began the study of the New Testament in a polemical spirit; after four years' study of it he was converted. Baptized in 1825.

[17] Given in Hechler, Appendix, p. 62 ff.

[18] Hechler, Appendix, pp. 104 ff. In a footnote on p. 104 it is pointed out that whereas the English document is issued anonymously, the French translation calls the whole "the official document published by the Archbishop."

ening them against the encroachments of the see of Rome, and preparing the way for their purification, in some cases from serious errors, in others from those imperfections which now materially impede their efficiency as witnesses and dispensers of Gospel truth and grace. . . .

"While the Church of Rome is continually, and at this very moment, labouring to pervert the members of the Eastern Churches, and to bring them under the dominion of the Pope, sparing no arts nor intrigues, hesitating at no misrepresentations, sowing dissension and discord amongst an ill-informed people, and asserting that jurisdiction over them which the ancient Churches of the East have always strenuously resisted, the two great Protestant powers of Europe will have planted a Church in the midst of them, the Bishop of which is specially charged not to entrench upon the spiritual rights and liberties of those Churches; but to confine himself to the care of those over whom *they* cannot rightfully claim any jurisdiction; and to maintain with them a friendly intercourse of good offices; assisting them, so far as they may desire such assistance, in the work of Christian education; and presenting to their observation, but not forcing upon their acceptance, the pattern of a Church essentially scriptural in doctrine and apostolical in discipline.

"The Bishop . . . will establish and maintain, as far as in him lies, relations of Christian charity with other Churches represented at Jerusalem, and in particular with the orthodox Greek Church; taking special care to convince them, that the Church of England does not wish to disturb, or divide, or interfere with them; but that she is ready, in the spirit of Christian

love, to render them such offices of friendship as they may be willing to receive." [19]

Similarly in the Letters Commendatory, dated November 23, 1841, it is expressly said that

". . . in order to prevent any misunderstanding in regard to our purpose, we think it right to make known to you," that is, the Eastern Church, "that we have charged the said Bishop our Brother not to intermeddle in any way with the jurisdiction of the Prelates or other Ecclesiastical Dignitaries bearing rule in the Churches of the East. But to show them due reverence and honour; and to be ready, on all occasions, and by all means in his power, to promote a mutual interchange of respect, courtesy, and kindness. . . .

"We trust that your Holiness will accept this communication as a testimony of our respect and affection, and of our hearty desire to renew that amicable intercourse with the ancient Churches of the East, which has been suspended for ages, and which, if restored, may have the effect, with the blessing of God, of putting an end to divisions which have brought the most grievous calamities on the Church of Christ." [20]

IV. The Tractarian Reaction.

The connection of the Jerusalem Bishopric with Tractarianism is best known through

[19] Hechler, *op. cit.*, App. pp. 106, 108, 110 (London, Dec. 9, 1841).

[20] Hechler, Appendix, pp. 97-99.

Newman's condemnation of the scheme. The *Apologia* has given it a place of permanence in literature no less than in history.[21] But not all the Tractarians were opposed to the move. Opinion among these was divided, the chief writers in opposition being Newman, Pusey, Deacon Palmer, Hope-Scott, the *British Critic* generally, and *The Times;* those in favour, William Palmer, Perceval, Hook, and "Anglo-Catholicus."

The "Times"

The controversy began with an announcement in *The Times* of October 11, 1841, to the effect that Palestine, so prominent before the public during the preceding twelve months, was to be bound by a new link to Britain through the creation of a Protestant Bishopric at Jerusalem as a result of negotiations with the Prussian Government, and that the person to be consecrated was the Rev. M. S. Alexander. On the 19th of October the same newspaper devoted a leading article to the subject.[22] According to this, the new prestige of Britain in Turkey ought to involve a close support of the Orthodox Church, which is the lawful Church

[21] Newman, *Apologia,* end of Part V, and beginning of VI.

[22] The author was Roundell Palmer. See *Selborne Memorials, Family and Personal,* Vol. I, p. 317.

in those lands, and its Patriarch of Jerusalem the lawful descendant of St. James. It laments that Great Britain has not been properly sensitive to the susceptibilities of the Orthodox, and cites as an instance the recent deposition of the Patriarch of Constantinople [23] at the request of the British Ambassador.

"Since that time," continues the editorial, "the representative of Queen Victoria in the East has taken further steps to separate his country from all sympathy with those Churches by identifying himself with parties who are seeking to found a Protestant sect at Jerusalem. . . . The Church of England may be committed by her rulers to take part in the unwarrantable invasion of her Oriental sister in Palestine. . . . It appears certain that our bishops have been solicited to identify the English Church with German Protestantism, and at the instigation of a foreign Lutheran prince to organize a rival communion to the Greek Orthodox Church within the Patriarchate of Jerusalem."

The *Standard* in the evening of the same day, October 19, 1841,[24] undertook to defend the scheme by pointing out that as a matter of fact the Patriarch of Jerusalem did not reside in Jerusalem at all, but at Constantinople; that

---

[23] *I.e.*, Patriarch Gregory VI, removed at the instance of Lord Ponsonby because believed to be the tool of Russia.

[24] *Standard* editorial. There is more on the subject in the *Standard* of Nov. 15, 1841.

far from being the sole holder of that title, it was enjoyed by some six or seven others belonging to rival communions. It also maintained that with the opening up of Palestine and the attraction of immigrants, there would be felt the great disadvantage of Protestantism, namely, "the absence of any known and organized ecclesiastical authority, so that converts to Christianity, or members of Protestant Churches, were considered by the Turks as little else than vagabonds." This defect the proposed Bishopric would help to set right.

The leading article in *The Times* of the 26th of the same month attempts to answer all these points, but more particularly does it deal with the relation of the Church of England to the Eastern Church. It quotes extensively from Palmer's *Treatise on the Church* against encouraging schism in that Church, or invading its territory. These editorials in *The Times* called forth two weighty letters in reply, one by "Anglo-Catholicus" and the other by William Palmer of Worcester College, appearing respectively in the issues of the 28th and the 29th of October.

The letter of "Anglo-Catholicus" argues that, far from intending hostility to the Eastern

Church, this move was a mark of friendship.

"Anglo-Catholicus"

"You are well aware that the Bishop of Rome, backed by the influence and intrigues of the French Ambassador, is and has long been, seeking by every means which force or fraud can supply, to undermine the independence of the Greek Church throughout the East, and reduce it to submit to his usurpation. To England alone and to her Church they look for succour, but they look in vain throughout the East for anyone authorized to represent the English Church." The reason why the consent of the Patriarch was not obtained was, according to this writer, "because they are not in a condition to grant it if they would. It might be made a pretext for their degradation at any moment. . . . Under these circumstances when the Church is overridden by an infidel power, ready at any time to degrade or bowstring her chief governors, thus depriving them in great part of their free agency, is any one prepared to say that Catholic principles, in their utmost rigidity . . . are to be followed by our bishops to their extremest results?"[25]

[25] It has been impossible to identify the writer. The pseudonym "'Anglo-Catholicus" had been used four months earlier by Lord John James Robert Manners in his "What are the English Roman Catholics to Do?" June 14, 1841. But there is no proof that he wrote the above letter also.

This well-informed letter was followed by that from Palmer, which is noteworthy because of a tone of authority, suggesting that its writer shared the counsels of officials in the Anglican Church. Palmer is prepared to justify the appointment of an Anglican Bishop for Orthodox territory because *actually* the two communions are in a state of separation, and therefore persons belonging to the Anglican Church are unable to receive ministrations from Orthodox clergy. It would not be interfering "with the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Jerusalem, because he does not claim or exercise jurisdiction over those who are, *de facto,* separated from his communion." Palmer declares that he is enabled "to state, on the highest authority, that the appointment of a Bishop in Palestine is not designed as an interference with the prior claims and jurisdiction of the orthodox Oriental Church," which contention is seen to be upheld also by the recent pronouncement of the Archbishop (*i.e.,* the "Statement of Proceedings") with reference to the new Bishopric. "The friendly correspondence," he continues, "which exists between the heads of our Church and those of the Oriental Churches furnishes in itself a pledge that the Bishop who is to be sent

William Palmer

into Palestine will be provided with such instructions as will tend to promote the union of Churches instead of impeding it." And after praising the King of Prussia and his motives in this matter, the letter concludes: "The institution of a Bishop of the Anglo-Catholic communion in Palestine, under whose jurisdiction Prussian, as well as English, subjects will be allowed to place themselves and to receive orders when duly qualified, promises to be one amongst several causes which tend to the increase of sound religion and the revival of ecclesiastical government in Germany."

Deacon Palmer of Magdalen

Quite different is the attitude of William Palmer of Magdalen College. Deacon Palmer seems to have become acquainted with the scheme in 1839.[28] After the visit to Russia in 1840-1841, and toward the end of 1841, the matter was brought up in conversation with some acquaintance from Oriel. "They spoke of M. Bunsen's contemplated Bishopric at Jerusalem, and of the probable effect such a formal recognition of foreign Protestantism by our Church might have *in causing secessions to Rome*. Mention was made of certain attempts to give an '*Anglo-Catholic*' colouring to the proposed meas-

[28] See above, page 88.

ure, or at least to present two or three different views of it at once in different quarters: and, in particular, a Letter was alluded to, which had appeared in the Newspapers. . . .[27] By way of shewing what sort of non-interference and friendship for the Eastern Church was likely to be really contemplated, even though there should be no public union with the Prussian Establishment, and so with Continental Protestantism generally, I gave some account of what had passed in the matter of (Prince Galitzin's)[28] family: upon hearing which, one of those present[29] said, with some energy, that really it was the duty of anyone who was in possession of such facts, to make them known: that he feared not so much a secession of twenty or thirty persons (which was then talked of) as the continual recurrence of secessions afterwards, so as to be a constant drain upon the Church, if her position should be felt to be changed in external relations."[30]

Deacon Palmer's hostility to the scheme led him to memorialize the Archbishop against it in November 1841,[31] and when the consecration

[27] *I.e.*, the letter to *The Times* by Palmer of Worcester. See above, pp. 118-119.

[28] See next chapter.

[29] The context shows this was Newman.

[30] Deacon Palmer, *Appeal*, etc., pp. cxxii f.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. cxxv.

of the new Bishop was an accomplished fact he prepared a lengthy "Protest [32] against Anglo-Prussian Protestantism," the draft of which was sent to the Archbishop. At the request of the latter, communicated through Dr. Routh, of Magdalen College, the publication of the Protest was withheld. But Dr. Routh added that "he saw nothing at all to prevent (Palmer's) publishing what (he) had to urge against the new Bishopric in some other form: and that there was a good deal of matter in the notes and appendices to the Protest which he could wish to see published, especially the extracts from private journals kept in Russia." [33] This was accordingly done in the same year.[34]

[32] The "Protest" is found in the *Appeal to the Scottish Bishops,* Introduction, Section v. In this Protest, the text of which is found on pp. cxxv-cxxxix, the author argues that the Church of England teaches the idea of a hierarchy possessing "by divine right dogmatic authority," and that, on the other hand, Lutherans and Calvinists are not Churches but mixed multitudes. He inveighs against the false heretical principles of Dissent and Protestantism. He regrets the Protestant leanings of modern Anglicans and their indifference to the possibility of an approach to the East, and thinks the Church of England ought to settle what her relationship to the Eastern Church really is. He illustrates the charge of inconsistency on her part by relating his own experiences in connection with the Galitzin case, and the fact that the Archbishop gave him no letter of commendation to the Russians for the visit of 1840-1841.

[33] *Appeal,* etc., p. cxl.

[34] In: "Aids to Reflection on the seemingly double character of the Established Church, with reference to the foundation of a 'Protestant Bishopric' at Jerusalem, recently announced in the Prussian State Gazette," 1841. This was followed in August, 1842, by "An Examination of an Announcement made in the Prussian State Gazette concerning the relations of the 'Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland in Jerusalem' with 'the German congregation of the

Palmer's great objection, as revealed in these writings, is to the identification of the Church of England with Protestant sects, and he argues that this is a departure from the traditional principles of that Church. So serious, according to him, has that departure been already, that now "nothing more than the formal assent of a Convocation or Synod to the same principle and position is wanting to make union with the Eastern Church impossible and to destroy the Catholic Character of the English Church." [35] But he believes there are signs of a survival of more Catholic principles, such as will lead the Church of England to seek the conversion of Lutherans and Calvinists, rather than "by owning one common Protestant religion with them as they are now, incur the anathemas of the Eastern as well as the Western Latin Church, make reconciliation impossible, and give up the Catholic principle, by which alone she exists herself as a true Church." [36] And he adds that "there is good reason to expect and believe that if the English Church should ever openly and sincerely disavow the

---

Evangelical Religion in Palestine.' By a Member (*i.e.*, Palmer) of the Church of England," 1842. But this is not concerned with the Eastern Church.

[35] W. Palmer, *Aids to Reflection*, etc., Section v.

[36] *Ibid.*, Section vi.

heretical *principle* of Protestantism, or of community in religion with Protestant sects as such, and attempt to open communications with the Eastern Catholic Church for the restoration of unity upon Catholic principles, her advances would be met in a reasonable and Christian spirit." [37]

James R. Hope (later Hope-Scott), one of the foremost laymen in the Oxford Movement, was at first favourably inclined to the project, believing "that the scheme was one for bringing the Prussians at Jerusalem by legitimate means into the Church of England." [38] But in his case also this earlier attitude changed because of the prospect of Anglican association with Protestants. He makes scarcely a reference to the possible effect of the new Bishopric upon the Eastern Church. In the *Memoirs* [39] it is suggested that, as in the case of his bosom friend Newman, the founding of this Bishopric was the crisis in his life, leading him to doubts regarding the English Church, and turning his steps towards Rome.

J. R. Hope-Scott

[37] *Ibid.*, Section vii.

[38] *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,* Vol. I, p. 288. See also Vol. I, Cc. xv, xvi, xvii; Vol. II, C. xviii.

[39] *Ibid.*, Ch. xv. A weighty letter from Hope on this Bishopric appeared in the Press, but it had to do with the legal aspect of the subject, not with Anglo-Eastern relations.

Newman

The crisis in Newman's life was due largely to the same cause, but here again it was not prompted by any special concern for the Eastern Church, so far as can be gathered from his writings and correspondence. Rather was it because the Church of England was about to be associated with Protestant Churches, and so be understood to sanction heresies such as Lutheranism and Calvinism.[40] This is brought out in his correspondence with the editor of *The Times*. With reference to the editorials in *The Times* quoted above, the prominent feature of which was a genuine concern for the Churches of the East, Newman proceeded to write to the editor, Mr. Walter, though the letter was not published. The draft sent to Walter begins thus: "The appointment of a Bishop to Palestine on the part of the English Church is too grievous a matter to be passed over in silence by those who, while they are opposed to it, do not take the ground against it which has been so ably defended in your column." [41]

[40] See *Letters of J. H. Newman*, 1898 ed., Vol. II, 352 (Letter to Keble, Oct. 5, 1841); also pp. 315-341.

[41] Possibly the letter was not written, but only the draft of it, which has fortunately been preserved. The date is November 1, 1841. Its closing sentences are: "Nor is this all. I see it now professed that an understanding is to exist between our Bishop and the Greek Orthodox body. This was an afterthought. The main object was, and I be-

The extent of Newman's perturbation can be seen from the concluding section of Part V of the *Apologia:* "This was the third blow, which finally shattered my faith in the Anglican Church. That Church was not only forbidding any sympathy or concurrence with the Church of Rome, but was actually courting an intercommunion with protestant Prussia and the heresy of the Orientals." This attitude of his issued in a "Protest" [42] dated November 11, 1841, and sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Oxford, the ground for it being that Anglicanism was about to give recognition to heresy anathematized both by East and West.

The Bishopric was founded, and the new Bishop consecrated. Newman nevertheless persisted in refusing acquiescence, and prayed, in 1844, that it might "utterly fail and come to nought and be as though it had never been." [43]

Keble agreed on the whole with Newman's Protest, but pleaded for caution both in the in-

---

lieve is, to negotiate with the heretical Monophysites especially of Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia is the way to the Euphrates; the Euphrates is the way to India. It is desirable to consolidate our Empire. . . ." *Correspondence of J. H. Newman,* p. 151.

[42] This Protest is in *Apologia,* Part V.

[43] *Life of Pusey,* II, 259 f. Deacon Palmer, *Appeal* . . . cxxii.

terpretation of the announcement in the Press and in the general tone of the Protest itself. Regarding the latter he would have liked "if not too late . . . a little expression of reverence to those whom you are censuring to be somewhere introduced." "This step you are taking," he writes, "seems to be a new kind of thing, for a presbyter formally to protest against an act of his metropolitan (and, I suppose, by construction, of his diocesan). But then the occasion seems grievous and unprecedented." [44] But Keble himself ere long felt that something had to be done to check the movement, and even had the idea of preparing a petition against it.[45] It is evident, however, from his allusions to the project that his criticisms were not due primarily to considerations for the welfare of the Eastern Church.

Keble

Pusey's contribution to the discussion is of great importance. At first he, too, was disposed to favour the scheme, because he believed that

---

[44] Keble's (unpublished) letter, at Keble College, to Newman, Nov. 15, 1841. It contains the passage: "You are quite sure of your interpretation of the word Protestant in this transaction? I thought it meant English Catholics who might happen to be out there."

[45] Keble to Newman, Nov. 23, 1841 (Unpublished letter, at Keble College): ". . . I am thinking of a Petition of some sort grounded on the advertisement in *The Times* about the 'Bishopric for Palestine.'"

it was intended to meet the needs of Jewish converts who, he had been led to understand, formed together with the English a substantial congregation at Jerusalem. As to the Prussian Christians, he hoped that any of these, placing themselves under the Anglican Bishop, would be absorbed in the Church of England and become Catholicized.[46] But he changed his views when he discovered that the congregation at Jerusalem was of a handful of people only, and when he reflected upon the precise significance of the new move and more particularly upon the idea of union with Protestants.[47]

Pusey

In Pusey's letter to the Archbishop several reasons are given against the Bishopric, of which the first is that "it is an experiment, and that in so serious a thing as the Christian Church." [48] Other objections are: the impression such association would make upon the

---

[46] *Letter to the Archbishop,* 2d ed., 1842, p. 114. See also in *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,* Pusey's Letter to Hope, July 24, 1841: "I trust that our alliance with Prussia, or rather that of the State, will bring them up towards us, not lower us to them. . . . The present King of Prussia, you know probably, is in heart an Episcopalian. Altogether, it seems a movement toward something better on the part of Prussia, which I should not be inclined to oppose if I could (as far as I understand it)."

[47] Pusey, Letter to the Archbishop, pp. 111 ff. Pusey approved of Newman's Protest: *cp. Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,* I, 311.

[48] *Letter to the Archbishop,* p. 114.

Eastern Church [49]; the absence of "safeguards that the Bishop so sent, or Congregations so formed, shall not proselytize or consent to receive proselytes from the Orthodox Communion;" [50] the effect of Anglicans joining with Protestants, and of the possible hostility of the Eastern Church, upon those in England who were becoming most sensitive of the character of the English Church and were beginning to see in her a resemblance to the Donatist schism;[51] the further danger of Anglicans consorting with Eastern heretics, "involving ourselves with Monophysites or any heretical sect." [52]

Pusey's concern was so great as to lead him to discuss the matter both with Archbishop Howley and with the Archbishop's chaplain, the Rev. Benjamin Harrison. He remained sanguine for a time, then changed for the reasons indicated. But having made his views known, he accepted the inevitable. Once the Bishopric was established, Pusey, unlike Newman who prayed for its overthrow, hoped for the best regarding the experiment. To quote his biographer: "Pusey's natural temperament, and his firm trust in God's providential care of the

[49] Pusey, *Letter to the Archbishop*, 2d ed., p. 115.
[50] *Ibid.*, p. 116. [51] *Ibid.*, p. 119. [52] *Ibid.*, p. 120.

English Church, always disposed him to make the best he could of a mistake or disaster. So, putting the alliance with the Prussian Protestants out of view, he dwells with satisfaction, though not unalloyed by anxiety, on 'the consecration of a Bishop to represent our ancient British Church in the city of the Holy Sepulchre.' He even writes, 'We may look with comfort and hope to an act which again gives us an interest and a portion in the Holy Sepulchre, and unites around it representatives of the three branches of the Church Catholic.' " [53]

Financial support had been given to the Bishopric by W. F. Hook, Vicar of Leeds and later Dean of Chichester, and he was led to write an answer to criticisms passed upon him for so doing. His defence shows that he was convinced that the critics were chiefly persons who objected to any approaches of the Church of England toward Protestants, and, who either undervalued, or positively disliked, the Reformation. Much of his argument, therefore, is a defence of the Reformation, and an attempt to show that in the appreciation of it lay the dif-

W. F. Hook

[53] *Life of Pusey,* II, 259. The quotations are from Pusey's Letter to the Archbishop, 3d ed., pp. 110-111.

ference between the two wings of the party, the "Church-of-England" men, and the newer school within Tractarianism. "*Their* view of the Reformation leads them to look on other branches of the Catholic Church with admiration, and to desire that our Church may be altered so as to be brought into general accordance with their discipline and practice. *Our* view of the Reformation—the view of the good old school of Church-of-England divinity—leads us to look upon our Church as a model, not perfect indeed, but still a pure model of a reformed Catholic Church. Instead of making alterations in order to conciliate foreign Churches to our communion, we would remain as we are, and call upon foreign Churches to reform themselves, that so we may admit them into communion with us." [54]

Hook's conviction is that the Church of England may be considered as "intended to be the Moderator of Christendom: to help forward the Reformation of the other Catholic Churches of the West and of the East, and to bring back to the communion of the Catholic Church those Protestant communities on the continent, which were separated from it by no

[54] Walter Farquhar Hook, *Reasons for Contributing Towards the Support of an English Bishop at Jerusalem,* 1842, p. 8.

fault of their own." [55] And the Bishopric is approved because it will tend to fulfil this great purpose. It will do so as regards the Churches of the East: "It will invite the attention of the Orientals to the fact that we are a Church—a Branch of the Catholic Church; while by our silent protest against their superstitious practices, and our quiet exhibition of Godliness, they will be led to examine their own estate towards God and man, and to take us for the model of a Reformation, not to be fanatically forced by us, but to be canonically conducted by them." [56] Such an appointment would be no usurpation of Eastern jurisdiction. The Bishop would be "as a representative of the English Church, in a land where such conduct is tolerated with respect to other Branches of the Catholic Church, to discharge the ministerial office for those who cannot be received into communion with the Oriental Church, and to watch over the intrigues of the Church of Rome, which certainly can have no more right to have a representative at Jerusalem than we have; all this cannot have a tendency . . . to continue the division which unhappily exists in the Catholic Church. That a division does exist the Orientals know as well as we do: we may de-

[55] Hook, *op. cit.*, page 9. [56] *Ibid.*, p. 10.

plore the fact but a fact it is, whether we deplore it or not." [57]

Lastly, there is Perceval, who at first was less sanguine about the proposal than was Pusey.[58] But in 1843 he published a vindication of the whole proceedings in connection with the Bishopric. The one matter in which he does manifest some anxiety, peculiar to himself, relates to Confirmation. He fears lest unconfirmed Lutherans should be admitted to Communion; but he decides there are safeguards provided, and that the Bishop would surely not go against the judgment of the Church of England which insists on Confirmation prior to Communion.[59]

Perceval

[57] *Ibid.,* p. 11. Hook further denies that any Catholic principle has been violated in that the Bishops alone made the appointment. As there was no Convocation, the Church of England in those days could never act as a whole. The fact that the appointment was made without the concurrence of the presbyters is thought by him to leave the presbyters free to decide for themselves whether to support the scheme or not. While he blames no one, under the circumstances, for refusing to coöperate, he himself chooses to trust the judgment of Archbishop Howley and the three prelates who assisted in the consecration of Bishop Alexander. He supports this view by quoting approvingly the "Letters Commendatory" given to the new Bishop. Hook also devotes much space to the defence of Prussian Protestants—basing his arguments on Palmer's *Treatise*—showing that it was by misfortune, and not by deliberate rejection on their part, that they were without the Episcopate. He also shows that the signing of the Augsburg Confession would ensure the Orthodoxy of any ordained by the Bishop at Jerusalem.

[58] *Life of Pusey,* II, 251-252.

[59] A. P. Perceval, *A Vindication of the Proceedings Relative to the Mission of Bishop Alexander to Jerusalem,* 1843, pp. 14-15.

In other respects, the scheme receives his commendation. Having shown that the new Bishop "has been consecrated and sent by the chief spiritual rulers of our Church, without (as far as appears) a single dissentient voice in the Episcopate, and with the full and expressed concurrence of the civil authorities of our nation," [60] he goes on to defend the worthiness of the mission, and the means by which it was brought about. Some of the reasons which, to his mind, justify the new Bishopric are "that the churches of the English customs and language may be adequately represented in the East; (that) our Apostolic character and our Catholic faith (may) be notified and made known by the presence of one of the Apostolic order from among us, as our ambassador to Apostolic churches," [61] and that "a step may be taken towards renewing between us and the Eastern Christians the terms of friendship and Christian brotherhood, if not actual interchange of communion; thus drawing together in one all things in Christ." [62]

On the question of the means whereby the Bishopric came into being, that is to say the co-operation with Protestants on the one hand, and on the other the invasion of Orthodox

[60] A. P. Perceval, *op. cit.*, p. 5. [61] *Ibid.*, p. 7. [62] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

territory, he thinks they can be justified. As regards the former he contends that if German Protestants want to help the Master's service they should not be spurned: "It does not appear that either from the nature of the offer, nor from the person who made it, our Bishops could have drawn either objection or warrant for rejecting the means of promoting their Master's service thus offered for their acceptance." [63] And as to the objection that the Bishops will have to be nominated alternately by the King of Prussia, "Our bishops," he points out, "are not expected or asked to consecrate the King of Prussia's nominee, unless he has been *first approved of by the Archbishop of Canterbury,* to whom an ABSOLUTE VETO is secured." [64]

His defence of the establishment of an Anglican Bishopric in territory theoretically belonging to the Eastern Church deserves quotation at length: "If the authority which the Bishop of the Greek Catholics, whose style is Patriarch of Jerusalem, though his residence is always at Constantinople, claims in Palestine is *territorial,* so as to challenge the ecclesiastical allegiance of all Catholics in the Holy Land; and if he be in such a position as to be able to

[63] A. P. Perceval, *op. cit.,* p. 10. [64] *Ibid.,* p. 11.

exercise all his functions, and therefore to demand all his privileges, the most proper and canonical way of proceeding, and most in accordance with Christian brotherhood, would no doubt have been to make formal application for formal permission before the Mission was undertaken. But if it be *doubtful,* whether the Greek Patriarch of Jerusalem claims any other than a *personal* jurisdiction over those who observe the Greek rites; if it be certain that the state of bondage and oppression by the infidels under which the Greek Church labours deprives the prelates of that Church in the land of their oppressors from the free exercise of their authority, in a matter which, through political causes and machinations, influencing Russian jealousy or Turkish suspicion, might only entail troubles on them; and if there is ground to believe (as I am assured) that, as far as they have felt themselves at liberty to express a wish, that wish is in concurrence with the undertaking, then . . . all the exigence of the case required, or admitted, was accomplished in the Epistle Commendatory of our English Patriarch to the Ecclesiastical authorities of the East. And that this is so regarded by the Greek Episcopate, we seem to have reasonable proofs, both positive and negative; positive, in the

friendly reception which Bishop Alexander is stated to have received from the authorities of the Greek Church, and in the respect which has been evinced by them for the Archbishop's commendatory letter." [65]

Conclusion

In considering the criticisms by the Tractarians it is not easy to understand why certain parts of the measure should have been thought by them so sudden and unheard of. The year 1841 had already seen the establishment of the Colonial Bishopric Fund, one of the objects of which was the appointing of an Anglican Bishop to exercise jurisdiction in the Mediterranean. A step of this kind had been advocated in 1840 by one in sympathy with the Oxford Movement, James Beaven, in his work *On Intercourse Between the Church of England and the Churches in the East; and the Ecclesiastical Condition of the English Abroad.*[66] The author urges there, with a view to strengthening Anglican and Eastern relations, precisely this plan of appointing a Bishop for the Mediterranean.[67] Besides his general episcopal superintendence

[65] A. P. Perceval, *op. cit.*, pp. 8-9.

[66] This work had appeared as a series of articles in the *British Magazine*. These were reprinted in book form, with alterations. London, 1840. The work was reviewed in the *British Critic* for July, 1841.

[67] James Beaven, work cited in text above, page 69.

in that region, his work would be to promote a better understanding with the Eastern Church, to remove any jealousies of Greek prelates towards the Church of England, and to exert perhaps an influence on the Turkish government, thus preventing the oppression of Greek Christians.[68] "The argument in favor of a Bishop," continues the writer, "may perhaps derive additional strength from the consideration that . . . in the Levant . . . the people have become generally acquainted with the fact that the Church of England is episcopal. This, of course, tells a great deal in our favour in the sight of the Eastern Churches, and even in the sight of the public authorities of those countries who know of none other than Episcopal Churches among them." [69]

And not only was it forgotten by the Tractarians that such a move had been anticipated by one of themselves, but they gave little or no attention to official utterances and documents proving that no wanton interference with the Eastern Church was contemplated; and there is a suggestion that this attitude of theirs was felt keenly by Anglican authorities. In support of the officials of the Church an article appeared in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette* of November 9,

[68] James Beaven, *op. cit.*, p. 76. [69] *Ibid.*, p. 108.

1841.[70] That publication was as a rule impartial, and was only intended to chronicle events in the Church of England; but the "misapprehensions" regarding the new Bishopric had been so great that it felt obliged to depart from its usual policy. In the article referred to it says: " . . . Our ecclesiastical rulers have not thought it consistent with the dignity of their office to notice the statements of the newspapers, but surely the notion of there being any intention on the part of our Bishops to invade the diocese of Jerusalem, or to encroach upon the rights of the legitimate Bishop, is too absurd to require a contradiction. They thought, no doubt, that our Church has a perfect right to send a Bishop to Jerusalem to exercise jurisdiction over its own members, and to be in friendly communication with the Bishops of the Oriental Church. . . . We are informed that the plan for the establishment of this see was made known to the Bishops assembled at the last meeting of convocation, and was approved by all who were present. . . . Surely every one must acknowledge, that in the present state of intercourse with the East, the best way of preventing improper interference with the dio-

[70] This was after the correspondence in *The Times,* etc., discussed above, pp. 114-119.

ceses of the Oriental Bishops, is to send a Bishop of our own to regulate that intercourse. This, indeed, is becoming daily more necessary from the peculiar circumstances in which the Christians of Palestine, Syria, and the neighbouring countries, are placed. . . . In the meantime we may mention this important fact, that no less than five Oriental Prelates, namely, one Patriarch and four Metropolitans, have written to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, requesting protection and assistance."

In the period subsequent to 1845 there were reasons for hostility to the Bishopric on the part of those interested in the Greek Church; but these reasons were not existing at the time of the inception of the scheme. The conclusion seems unavoidable that many Tractarians, because of the heat of the contest in which they found themselves engaged at home, were not in a position to take a detached and unimpassioned view of the measure; and that what really disturbed them was not so much the probable effect upon the Orthodox Communion, as the prospect of association with Lutheranism, and the implied affirmation thereby of the Protestantism of the Church of England.

Into the subsequent history of this Bishop-

ric [71] it is not necessary here to enter. Suffice it to say that if the persons chosen to fill that office had been more suitable and more equal to the occasion, its history probably would not have been one of failure, and the Jerusalem experiment might have fulfilled the best hopes of its promoters and proved a signal step toward Reunion. The project also failed because it had to contend against a campaign of misrepresentation. Yet some good purpose it did serve, in that it challenged the Church of England, not excluding the Tractarians, to give thought to the claims and position of the Eastern Church; and in that it helped to show who in the Oxford Movement had leanings toward Rome. In this respect a classification is not easy, since Pusey and Keble hold rather an intermediate position; but the discussion above shows that the men who were primarily loyal to the Church of England were among the supporters of the scheme, while its opponents numbered those who ultimately found their way to Rome. With the exception of Deacon Palmer, who is always in a class by himself, it is in this loyal Anglican section that one must look particularly for sympathy with the Eastern Church, for an appre-

[71] See *Dictionary of English Church History*, article "Jerusalem Bishopric."

ciative understanding of it, and for a disposition to welcome any movement tending to bring the two Churches together.[72]

The Tractarians who were sympathetic toward the Eastern Church were generally also the persons who were willing to give a trial to the proposed method of coöperating with the Evangelicals of Prussia, believing that in this way the Church of England could influence Orthodoxy and Protestantism alike. This particular plan of gradually Catholicizing, and in time uniting with the Prussian Church, was premature; but today it is by no means startling, in view of recent reunion proposals, whether of Lambeth Conferences or of eminent individuals in the Church of England.

---

[72] Frederick *Oakeley* was against the Bishopric. See *Life of Pusey,* II, 254-255. (Letter to Pusey, Nov. 16, 1841.)

The *British Critic* is opposed. See article on "The Bishopric of Jerusalem," July, 1843. The *British Magazine* refrains from criticism.

Pusey, it should be noted, approved of Newman's Protest. See Newman's letter to Hope, Nov. 14, 1841, in *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott,* I, 311.

Newman cannot understand Worcester Palmer's position: *Apologia,* Part VI, "There is that good fellow, Worcester Palmer, can whitewash the Ecclesiastical Commission and the Jerusalem Bishopric" (From a letter by Newman to R. W. Church, Dec. 25, 1841, in *Letters of J. H. Newman,* Vol. II, 338).

Newman was not wholly oblivious to the effect on the Eastern Church. *Apologia,* Part V: "There was great reason to suppose that the said Bishop was intended to make converts from the Orthodox Greeks, and the schismatical Oriental bodies, by means of the influence of England." But this has a minor place in his thinking.

Of the "Anglican" section, *Marriott* is favourable: Sermon on *The Church's Instruments,* 1841, p. 5, 18. So is *Benj. Harrison*: *cp.* his Charge, 1848.

Chapter IV.

Appendix C

A FORGOTTEN STAGE IN ANGLO-EASTERN RELATIONS

It is assumed by some writers that from the end in 1725 of the non-Juror episode, to the beginning of negotiations in 1841 for the Jerusalem Bishopric, there had been practically no intercourse of an official kind between the Anglican Church and the Eastern. It is possible that this judgment will have to be modified as the history of those years is more closely investigated. In any case, the date of resumption of intercourse can be confidently placed one or two years earlier than 1841, which is the usual date given.

Pusey, in his letter to the Archbishop, refers to "the Greek Communion which has just heard of us and is beginning to value us,"[1] and to the "re-opened intercourse with the East."[2] Roundell Palmer more definitely says, in Octo-

[1] *Letter to the Archbishop*, 2d. ed., 1842, p. 115. [2] *Ibid.*, 117.

ber 19, 1841, "It is generally understood that offers of amity and coöperation were made only last year, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London to the Greek Prelates of Athens and Constantinople." [3]

It is possible to discover some at least of the developments which these writers had in mind. It is quite certain that the Anglican Church since the beginning of the century, and particularly in the late thirties, had become deeply interested in the Eastern Communions. Both the Church Missionary Society and the Religious Tract Society had work in the Mediterranean, and were thus brought into contact with the Orthodox world. In 1838 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge sent two laymen, Mr. Ainsworth and Mr. Rassam, to make inquiry into the state of Christians in Kurdistan.[4] A consequence of that mission was the request by the Nestorian Patriarch to the Anglican Church for a clergyman to be sent "to assist them in the education and improvement of their people." [5] The Rev. G. P. Badger was appointed to this task, and after a delay of about two years, he reached Kurdistan in 1842.

[3] *The Times,* Editorial (See pages 95-96).

[4] George Percy Badger, *The Nestorians and Their Rituals,* 2 vols., 1852. Page xiv of Introduction.

[5] Reference as in [4].

He took with him letters commendatory from Archbishop Howley and the Bishop of London, "To their Holinesses the Patriarchs and other Prelates of the Christian Church in Mesopotamia and Coordistan," and one from the Archbishop addressed to "the Patriarchs and Prelates of the Holy Eastern Church." [6]

In writing to the "Holy Eastern Church" the Archbishop proceeds to commend Mr. Badger, "whom we have charged, as occasion may be offered, to salute your Holinesses in our name, and to express to you our respect and affection towards you, and our zeal and fervent desire for the welfare and peace of your churches. He will tell you all things that you may wish to know concerning our apostolical Church, and its feelings of love and kindness towards the ancient and apostolical churches of CHRIST in the East. Wherefore we entreat you to receive him as a brother, and to accept at our hands the expression of our constant goodwill towards you, which we would desire to offer by him." [7] The document is dated March 13, 1842. Although this is a comparatively late date, the extract above is given as illustrating the sentiments of the Anglican authorities at the time towards the Eastern Church.

[6] G. P. Badger, *op. cit.*, pp. xv-xviii. [7] *Ibid.*, page xvi.

About this time the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States also became interested in the East, and the Episcopal Mission to that part was founded (1839), with the Rev. J. J. Robertson and the Rev. Horatio Southgate as missionaries. They collaborated throughout with Mr. Badger of the Anglican Church.[8]

The most important step of all, however, was the visit to the East in the autumn of 1840 of the Rev. George Tomlinson, Secretary of the S. P. C. K. and later Bishop of Gibraltar. The meeting of that Society held on July 2, 1839, was called upon to consider a copy before it of a new translation of the Liturgy into Modern Greek undertaken by the Society. To inquire more closely into the needs of the Greek Church in the matter of Religious Literature, Mr. Tomlinson was instructed to proceed to

[8] Horatio Southgate, A Letter to the Members of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States from the Rev. Horatio Southgate, their missionary at Constantinople. New York, 1844. Pp. 4, 5, 9, etc.

Horatio Southgate, Narrative of a Tour to the Syrian (Jacobite) Church of Mesopotamia; with statements and reflections upon the present state of Christianity in Turkey, and the Character and Prospects of the Eastern Churches. New York, 1844. (Pp. 8, etc.)

An earlier Mission, the first Foreign Mission of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was that to Greece. The Rev. J. J. Robertson, who was later transferred to Constantinople, and the Rev. J. H. Hill, were its first missionaries. See the Reports for those years of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

the East.[9] Of his visit, and of his interviews with the Greek and Armenian Patriarchs and with the authorities of the Synod in the Kingdom of Greece, it need only be said that they were agreeable, and fruitful in results. Details are given in the *Ecclesiastical Gazette,* and in the S. P. C. K. Reports for those years. On this point an extract from the Rev. H. Southgate's journal may suffice:

"We have been favoured by a visit from the Rev. George Tomlinson. . . . He called on the Greek Patriarch, to whom he presented letters from the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, written in ancient Greek. He explained to the Patriarch the institution of the English Church, and the relation in which it stands to the Eastern Churches; dwelt much on the Catholic character of the English Church, and its friendly disposition toward the Mother Church of the East; he proposed the publication of some of the Greek Fathers; and entered into such explanations as seemed necessary to remove the misapprehension prevailing here respecting Western Christianity. I cannot but hope that his visit will prove the first step toward a deeper interest on the part of the Eastern Church."[10]

The Letters Commendatory given to Mr. Tomlinson, quoted below, have fortunately been preserved in his "Report of a Journey to the Levant," no date (c. 1841), pages 123-124.

---

[9] *Ecclesiastical Gazette,* July 9, 1839, page 2.
[10] *Ibid.,* May 10, 1842.

They help to throw light on an obscure period in the history of Anglo-Eastern Relations, and it is not unlikely that they are the communications Pusey and Roundell Palmer had in mind (see *ante*, p. 121-i). In any case they lend support to the view that the modern stage of these Relations began at some date earlier than that of the Jerusalem Bishopric proposal.

The Letters Commendatory from the Archbishop of Canterbury (William Howley) and the Bishop of London (Charles James Blomfield) to the Rev. George Tomlinson.

I. From the Archbishop:

Πᾶσι τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ τιμίοις καὶ ἀγαπητοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς τῆς Ἁγίας Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἐπισκόποις καὶ Προεστῶσι, θεοσεβέσι καὶ ὀρθοδόξοις, Γυλίελμος, θεοῦ προνοίᾳ Ἀρχιεπίσκοπος Καντουαρίας, πάσης τῆς Ἀγγλίας Μητροπολίτης, ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν·

Συνίσταμεν τῇ φιλανθρωπίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ εὐεργεσίᾳ, ἐν ὅτῳ ἂν χρῄζῃ πράγματι, τὸν πιστὸν ἡμῶν καὶ ἀγαπητὸν ἀδελφὸν Γεώργιον Τόμλινσον, πρεσβύτερον τῆς Λονδίνου διοικήσεως, ἄνδρα εὐσεβῆ καὶ φρόνιμον, εἰς τὰ ἀνατολικὰ μέρη τούτου χάριν ὁδοιποροῦντα, ἵνα τὰς τῶν ἁγίων Ἀποστόλων καὶ Πατέρων καθέδρας αὐτόπτης ἀσπασάμενος, καὶ τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὴν Ἁγίαν ἐν τῇ Ἀνατολῇ Ἐκκλησίαν γνωρίσας ὑμῖν εὔνοιαν, τὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ Χριστιανῶν πράγματα τοῖς ἐν Ἀγγλίᾳ ἀδελφοῖς ὀρθοδόξοις καὶ καθολικοῖς ἀκριβέστερον εἰδέναι θέλουσιν, ἀληθῶς μηνύῃ.

Αὐγούστου μηνὸς ἡμέρα γ΄ 1840

Ἐν Λονδίνῳ.

II. From the Bishop of London:

Τοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ ἀδελφοῖς, τοῖς τῆς Ἁγίας Ἀνατολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας Ἐπισκόποις, Κάρολος Ἰάκωβος, ἐλέῳ θεοῦ Ἐπίσκοπος Λονδίνου, ἐν Κυρίῳ χαίρειν·

Συνίσταμεν ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοὶ ἀγαπητοὶ καὶ θεοσεβεῖς, Γεώργιον Τόμλινσον, πρεσβύτερον ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας διοικήσεως, ἄνδρα εὐσεβῆ καὶ φρόνιμον, εἰς τὰ ἀνατολικὰ μέρη ὁδοιπορεῖν μέλλοντα, τούτου ἕνεκα, ἵνα τὰ τῶν ἐκεῖ Χριστιανῶν πράγματα ἀκριβῶς ἐπισκεψάμενος, σαφεστέρως ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐνθάδε ἀδελφοῖς διασημαίνῃ. Αὐτὸς δὲ δηλώσει ὑμῖν τὴν ἡμετέραν εἰς τὴν Ἁγίαν τὴν ἐν ὑμῖν Ἐκκλησίαν εὔνοιαν καὶ προθυμίαν.

Αὐγούστου μηνὸς ἡμέρα γ΄

Ἐν Λονδίνῳ.

Translation:

I.

To all the honorable and beloved brethren in Christ, the orthodox and devout Bishops and Leaders of the Holy Eastern Church, William, by the Providence of God Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, Greeting in the Lord.

We commend to your benevolence and good offices, as need thereof may arise, our faithful and beloved brother, George Tomlinson, a presbyter of the Diocese of London, a man of piety and discretion, who is traveling in the Levant. His purpose is to greet in person the Sees of the Holy Apostles and Fathers, to make known to you our good will toward the Holy

Church in the East, and by an accurate report about the state of affairs among Christians there to meet the desire of their orthodox and catholic brethren in England for more detailed information.

London, August 3rd, 1840.

II.

To our Brethren in Christ, the Bishops of the Holy Eastern Church, Charles James, by the Grace of God Bishop of London: Greeting in the Lord.

We commend to you, reverend and beloved Brethren, George Tomlinson, a presbyter from our diocese, a man of piety and discretion, who is about to set out for the Levant with the purpose of carefully reviewing the condition of Christians there, and thereby clarifying the issues for us their brethren at home. He will moreover express to you our cordial good will toward the Holy Church in your midst.

London, August 3rd.

Chapter V.

THE PALMER EPISODE

The most conspicuous instance of approach to the Eastern Church during the Tractarian period was due to the convictions of an individual who, though associated in a general way with the Oxford Movement, acted in this matter quite independently. The idea originated with him and was throughout connected with him personally. This personal element adds a peculiar interest to the incident.

But for all the originality of the conception and the unusual personality of the chief actor, the episode was unfortunate. It was unfair to the Church of England to have a biased and incomplete view of her given to the Russian Church authorities. Still more regrettable was it that after a century's lack of intercourse the East should be called upon to decide on an unrepresentative case. The previous instance had been that of the non-Jurors, who had given the Eastern Church to understand that they were the Church of England, and whose nego-

tiations came to an end in 1723 chiefly because of the interference of Archbishop Wake. The present attempt was not unlike the former, in that Palmer claimed to speak for the Anglican Church, whereas he only represented the Anglo-Catholic section of it, or, more accurately, he only represented himself.

William Palmer was the son of the Rev. William Jocelyn Palmer, rector of Mixbury in Oxfordshire. One of his brothers was Roundell Palmer, created first Earl of Selborne, and in 1872 and again from 1880 to 1885, Lord Chancellor under Gladstone. William Palmer entered Magdalen College in 1826, and was tutor there from 1838 to 1843. He decided after some hesitation to seek Holy Orders and was ordained deacon in 1836, but never proceeded beyond deacon's orders in the Church. On failing to gain admission into the Eastern Church on his own terms he joined the Church of Rome, in 1855, and remained in that Church to the end.[1]

[1] For biographical details compare *Selborne Memorials, Family and Personal,* 1766-1865, Vols. I and II, the chapters dealing with William Palmer. The chief dates are:

1811, born, July 12th.
1823, at Rugby School.
1826, matriculated at Magdalen College.
1833-36, Tutor at University of Durham.
1836, ordained Deacon by Bishop Bagot of Oxford.

(*Continued at bottom of next page.*)

Palmer was universally acknowledged to be possessed of a powerful intellect, profound learning, and strength of will; but he was chiefly noted for the qualities of sincerity, eccentricity, and combativeness. He was indifferent to questions of practicability, and did not understand the meaning of expediency. It was difficult for him to recognize a point of view differing from his own. Moreover, he was so painfully logical that he could not adapt himself to an actual situation which might be at variance with his own preconceived ideas. He was aptly characterized as "the great, the polemical, the disputatious."[2] Other young men, says the Earl of Selborne, though "combative, generally find out before long, that there are disturbing forces operating elsewhere, to which the ideal of abstract and absolute perfection, which they begin by setting up as a rule for themselves and others, must yield. . . . William had not that flexibility; and, for want of it, he was always more or less out of his ele-

---

1837-39, University Examiner, Oxford.
1838-43, Tutor at Magdalen College.
1840-41, first visit to Russia.
1851, final rejection by the Eastern Church.
1855, joined the Church of Rome.
1879, died at Rome, April 5th.

[2] Selborne, *op. cit.*, I, 259.

ment, and leading forlorn hopes in the battle of life." [3]

In religious matters he was always an extreme High Churchman, exhibiting marked antipathy to what he termed the "Protestant Principle," meaning thereby "the Right of Private Judgment." He was not one of the founders of the Oxford Movement, and though naturally led into association with the Tractarians, he was throughout independent of their leadership. His sympathies were with the Romeward section of the party, and in a Latin Introduction to the XXXIX Articles, written in the year before Tract 90 appeared, he anticipated the mode of interpretation adopted in that Tract, though Newman did not come to know of the existence of that work till after the death of its author.[4]

I. The Incident.

Palmer's interest in the Eastern Church was kindled, perhaps for the first time, through contact in 1837 with a member of the Nestor-

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 259-260. His writings struck even his sympathizers as violent. A singular contrary view is Keble's: "Perceval was here yesterday and said that W. Palmer of Magdalen had been writing another (what he termed) violent pamphlet about the Bishop of Jerusalem. I never can understand why people call his writings violent; to me they seem particularly calm." (Unpublished Letter to Newman, May 3, 1843. At Keble College library.)

[4] *Selborne Memorials, Family and Personal,* Vol. I, 271.

ian Communion who was then in England—a Mr. Christian Rassam, of Mosul. Again, while convinced that in England the Anglican rather than the Roman was the lawful Branch of the Church Catholic, his appreciation of things Roman had increased considerably as a consequence of visits to the Continent in 1838 and 1839. By this time "he had arrived, in his own mind, at an agreement with the Church called Eastern, or 'Orthodox,' upon all points of doctrine, except that relating to the Holy Spirit." [5] Such was his theological state when, on the occasion of the coming of the Tsarevits[6] to Oxford in the spring of 1839, he presented a petition to him asking that some Russian ecclesiastic be sent to Oxford for the purpose of examining Anglican theology, and requesting protection for himself if he should later on go to Russia with a view to making a study of the Russian Church.[7]

The project just indicated matured in 1840, when he undertook the journey to Russia.[8] He took with him his Letters of Orders signed by the Bishop of Oxford, a personal letter from Dr. Routh, President of Magdalen, and cer-

1. The Visit to the Russian Church

[5] *Ibid.*, I, 270-271. [6] Later known as Tsar Alexander II, 1855-1881.

[7] Selborne, *op. cit.*, 271. [8] Ref. as in [7].

tain introductions from the Ambassador to Russia, Lord Clanricarde. The Archbishop of Canterbury, as a matter of caution, declined to give Letters of Recommendation, Palmer having made it known that his intended visit was to be not so much one of investigation as a peculiar self-appointed mission to test the validity of a theory, to compel the defining of the relations between the two Churches, and to seek for himself recognition as a member of the Eastern Church in virtue of his membership in the Church of England.[9]

The first visit lasted from August 1840 to July 1841, the greater part of which was spent at St. Petersburg, the last two months at Moscow. It was a precursor of many others, the second being in 1842, in connection with the Galitzin incident mentioned below.

2. The Galitzin Case

In the spring of 1841 the wife and the eldest daughter of Prince Michael Galitzin left the Russian Church, and at Geneva were admitted by the Chaplain to communion in the Anglican Church. In his anxiety and efforts to bring about their return to their former ecclesiastical allegiance, the Prince wrote to Archbishop Howley in March 1841 enquiring

[9] See Ch. I, 22 f, for the Branch Theory and Palmer's views.

whether the Church of England did or did not excommunicate the Eastern Church, and whether an Anglican clergyman was authorized to receive to communion persons professing to be converts from Eastern Orthodoxy. To this no reply was received, and Palmer, whose assistance was sought, wrote to the Bishop of London in the same strain in September of that year. The Bishop in reply expressed himself in favour of "passive communion" and therefore did not censure the act of the Chaplain.[10]

The eldest daughter meanwhile had returned to the Russian Church, but the Princess persisted in considering herself a member of the Church of England. Palmer discovered this was so when, at the request of Prince Galitzin, he went to Paris in January 1842 for an interview with her. He then found that she was in the habit of communicating in Bishop Luscombe's[11] Chapel. Determining to make this

[10] *I.e.,* leaving it to the judgment of the person coming to communion, provided he is of good life and conversation.

[11] Bishop *Matthew Luscombe,* consecrated March, 1825, died 1846. The account of his appointment, as related by him to Palmer, is as follows: "Certain British residents of our Communion in France having for some time felt their need of Episcopal ministrations, especially for the Confirmation of their children, and seeing difficulties in the way of obtaining a Consecration from England, caused an application to be made to the Bishops of the Scottish Church, who proceeded in the matter with great caution, and only consented to Consecrate Dr. Luscombe to be Bishop of the Scots, English, and others

a test case, he proceeded to devote all his energies to excluding the lady from communion in the Church of England.

The first move in a contest which lasted nearly ten years was a letter he wrote to the Princess stating the issue as it appeared to him: "You know, I think, how I went to Russia advised by my Superior to seek to Communicate in the Russian Church as a member of the English, and how, when there, I was completely answered by the objection that you were in the mean time professing to have been received to the Communion of the 'Anglican Church of Geneva' as a convert from the Rus-

---

of their Communion abroad when they had most clearly ascertained that they might do so with the full consent and concurrence of the English hierarchy and of the Ministers of the Crown for the time being. . . . Afterwards, the new Bishop received the congratulations both of the chief English Prelates and of the Minister of the Crown." The Letters of Collation declared:

"He is sent by us representing the Scotch Episcopal Church, to the Continent of Europe, not as a diocesan Bishop, in the modern or limited sense of the word, but for a purpose similar to that for which Titus was left by Paul in Crete, that *he may set in order the things that are wanting* among such of the natives of Great Britain and Ireland as he shall find there professing to be members of the United Church of England and Ireland and the Episcopal Church of Scotland. . . . But . . . we . . . do solemnly enjoin the Right Reverend Brother Bishop Luscombe not to disturb the peace of any Christian Society established as a National Church in whatever nation he may chance to sojurn, but to confine his ministrations to British subjects, and to such other Christians as may profess to be of a Protestant Episcopal Church" (Palmer, *Appeal,* etc., 1849, Introd., Part III, Sec. i). Bishop Luscombe made Paris his residence.

On Bishop Luscombe, see also Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church,* page 9, footnote.

sian. You yourself must see, that either you, and those English people who think with you, or else I, and those who think with me, must be mistaking and misrepresenting the principles and character of the English Church."[12]

Bishop Luscombe was next persuaded to write to her explaining on what terms he was prepared to receive her as a communicant. Of the conditions laid down the significant one was that she "should be free from all kind of just excommunication by the canons of that Church in which she was Baptized and Confirmed."[13] The lady, choosing to ignore this or misunderstanding it, and believing herself to be complying with the terms of the letter, continued to communicate as usual, upon which the Bishop indicated to Palmer his satisfaction and his unwillingness to proceed further in the matter.[14] But Palmer's insistence in drawing the Bishop's attention to the non-fulfilment of the terms laid down led the latter to take a more

[12] *Appeal,* etc., Part III, Sec. II (page cliv of Introd., Jan. 20, 1842).

[13] *Ibid.,* Part III, Sec. ix, pages clxxxiii-iv. Bishop Luscombe's letter, dated Jan. 27, 1842, lays down three conditions of which the above is the third. The other two are: "That . . . (she) should believe all the Articles of the Christian Faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed, and desire to believe them in the same sense in which they were held by the English Church: (ii). That . . . (she) should have been Baptized in this Faith with water, in the name of the Holy Trinity, and Confirmed by a Bishop; or with Chrism consecrated by a Bishop."

[14] *Appeal,* Introd., III, Sec. xviii (pages ccxxv-ccxxvii).

serious view of the situation, and even to withhold from the Princess a certificate of communion for which she asked previous to leaving for St. Petersburg.[15]

To follow the case to a conclusion, Palmer proposed to Bishop Luscombe to go as his clerk to St. Petersburg, severing if need be all ties with Magdalen College and with the Church in England, and staying in Russia until the matter was settled. To the first part of the proposal the Bishop agreed, and Palmer left for St. Petersburg, by way of Scotland. In Scotland he saw a number of Bishops, who, however, declined to commit themselves to his views.[16]

On his arrival in Russia he found that a reconciliation had taken place between husband and wife, and that they were living happily together. Prince Galitzin urged him, in view of all this, to refrain from further interference. But to this request Palmer refused to accede.[17] He was determined to force the issue, and in virtue of the authority of Bishop Luscombe, he succeeded in preventing the Princess from communicating in the Anglican Church at St. Petersburg.[18]

---

[15] *Appeal,* Sec. i, pp. 1-7.
[16] *Ibid.,* Sec. ix, pp. 43-56.
[17] *Ibid.,* Sections xiv, xix, xx.
[18] *Ibid.,* Sections xxvi, xxvii.

If Palmer expected this to be the end of the matter he had seriously underestimated the strength of his antagonist's religious principles. To her the teaching and religion of the Evangelical section of the Anglican Church were as a divine revelation, and were as great a conviction and passion as was to Palmer his theory of the Church. And though, being a woman, at some disadvantage in the contest, her spirit was undaunted, and her determination no less than his whom she regarded as her persecutor.[19]

3. The Appeal to the Scottish Bishops

Parallel with this, and involved in it, was Palmer's endeavour to obtain from the Episcopal Church in Scotland official sanction for his peculiar interpretation of Anglicanism. At the bidding of the Russians he had anathematized certain theological propositions which, they declared, were to be found in or were deducible from the XXXIX Articles;[20] propositions these which would have been accepted in whole or in part by the Evangelicals within the

---

[19] *Ibid.*, Introd., p. ccxl: After receipt of Bishop Luscombe's conditions, and her succeeding in receiving communion from him in spite of them, she wrote to her husband in May, 1842, maintaining that she has had the best of the argument with Palmer. "All this," writes the Prince to Palmer, May 17th, "has only increased her discontent with me. She regards me as her persecutor, and you as my accomplice."

[20] See Part II of this chapter.

Anglican Church. The question therefore arose whether, in condemning these doctrines, he had renounced the Anglican Church herself. If the answer was in the affirmative, then the grounds upon which Princess Galitzin rested her case were justified. If he had not renounced the Anglican Church it would have meant that the Anglo-Catholic view was permissible, though not necessarily to the exclusion of any other. To secure this exclusion, however, the Appeal sought from the Scottish Bishops a definite pronouncement adverse to the Evangelical position, and against the practice of "passive communion." Bishop Luscombe, until his death in 1846, steadily gave his support to this Appeal. And Palmer persevered with it, until it was definitely rejected in Scotland in 1849.[21]

In the meantime the Princess neither acknowledged defeat nor remained inactive. She succeeded while in London in winning several to her side. A further interview with Palmer in England was without result, and he was now beginning to realize that there was room within Anglicanism for the Evangelical view. "It is undeniable," he writes, in 1848, "that the Anglican Communion in its existing state, though mixed, affords much countenance even

[21] *Appeal,* Supplementary Narrative, Section vi.

to the doctrinal views of the Lady; while in respect of the right of passive Communion there seems almost to be a clear case in her favour." [22]

In his efforts to secure a decisive Anglican pronouncement Palmer was unsuccessful. The Appeal was rejected, thus proving that both views could be maintained within the comprehensive system of the Anglican Church, and that the right of passive communion was upheld. The case was dropped in 1849, and Palmer, losing confidence in the Church of England, proceeded to seek admission into the Eastern Church, not as an Anglican now, but as a convert.

II. The Course of the Controversy.

Palmer's proceedings were based on his belief in the essential oneness of the two Churches. He knew that the emphasis on certain doctrines could not be the same, and that modes of expression might vary, but he maintained that fundamentally the two communions were one, and his efforts were largely directed to proving this identity. His views on the subject are to be found throughout the Appeal, and in his essays and letters.[23]

[22] *Appeal,* etc., Section lxxiii, p. 422.

[23] These writings are, I, The *Appeal,* which includes: (1) Introduction, pp. vii-xviii. A letter written at the request of Prince Galitzin (1840). (2) Intr., xliii-lxxxii (1840): reply to a letter

The position taken up in these writings was defended also in conversation and in interviews.[24] And, granting the correctness of his view of Anglicanism, it must be admitted that he succeeded in proving the close kinship of the two Churches, and especially in showing that where Romanism and Anglicanism differed, the Eastern Church was nearer to the Anglican than to the Roman. He had no difficulty in showing that the influence or intrigues of Rome's emissaries had caused Orthodox doctrine since the Schism to be given an alien, Roman Catholic direction, citing the XVIII Articles of the Synod of Bethlehem (1672) as the chief instance of this process. These Articles, which were intended to counteract the Protestant leanings of the XVIII Articles of Cyril Lucar, were issued by the Patriarch Dositheus of Jerusalem, and were partly designed to meet

from the Prince's daughter. (3) Answers to certain questions propounded by Prince Galitzin (1840). (4) pp. 152-252 (1843): Twelve dissertations containing an account of the character, practices, and theological position of the Church of England. This document originally had only seven dissertations. The twelfth is "Concerning the possibility of future union between the Eastern and the British Churches."

II. "Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the doctrine of the . . . Churches of the East," written in collaboration with the Rev. R. W. Blackmore, 1846.

III. Of special importance are the earlier letters to Khomiakoff, commencing with the year 1844. In Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*.

[24] *Cp.* Palmer, *Notes of a Visit,* etc., esp. Ch. xiii, 68-69.

the wishes of the French Ambassador, M. de Nointel. In several directions, notably on Transubstantiation, Purgatory, and the withholding of the Scriptures from the people in general, these Articles are decidedly Roman. When a translation was made by the Russian Synod in 1838 the alien elements were quietly left out.[25]

Now it was precisely Palmer's contention regarding the nature of the English Church that the Russians were in a position to question.

1. With the Russian Church

They knew that there was more than one interpretation of Anglicanism, and that whereas Palmer's theories commended themselves to one section, their contradictories were also maintained within the same communion. It would be known that there were Anglican clergymen who were in sympathy with Protestantism; that it was impossible to dissociate the Church of England from the Reformation; that, though not assuming the title "Protestant," she was nevertheless the "*Reformed* Church of England"; and that alongside the "Catholic" liturgy of which the Tractarians made a great deal were the "XXXIX Articles of Religion"

[25] Palmer, however, was quick to detect these alterations and bring them to the notice of the Russians. But these three were not the only changes: *Cp.* Leighton Pullan, Bampton Lectures, 1923, pp. 205-206.

showing the influence of the Continental Reformation. The religious leaders in Russia believed there was a Protestant element in the Church of England, which Palmer chose to ignore or to deny, and to commend in its place a view of Anglicanism by no means acknowledged by the whole of that Church.

These considerations were being continually pressed upon him. Count Pratasoff, High Procurator of the Russian Synod, on hearing Palmer's ideas on the subject of icons, the seven sacraments, and related matters, retorted: "You have a chaplain here, and another at Cronstadt: do they agree with you? . . . If such are really the doctrines of the Anglican Church, how is it that you do not teach them to the people? . . . Do you mean to tell me that the *Bishops* in England hold and teach such doctrines as you have now been professing?" [26] Mouravieff was more outspoken: "We know you only as heretics. You separated from the Latin Church 300 years ago, as the Latins had before that fallen away from the Greeks. We think even the Latin Church heretical; but you are an apostasy from an apostasy; a progression from bad to worse." [27]

---

[26] *Notes of a Visit,* etc., pp. 118-119.

[27] *Notes of a Visit,* etc., p. 229. A. N. Mouravieff, the historian

Besides their objection to the Protestantism of a part of the Church of England, there was constant reference to the heresy shared by all its members including Palmer, namely, that of the *Filioque*. Nor were they able to appreciate the Tractarian theory of Catholicity and Unity. The Eastern Church stresses unity rather than union, dogmatic agreement rather than oneness of organization; so that it was difficult for them to understand, for instance, the Tractarian idea that, whereas all Roman Catholics held the same doctrines, they could be considered members of the Catholic Church in some parts of the world and schismatics elsewhere.

To this Palmer Episode there were several conclusions, each intended to be final; but Palmer's persistence led each time to the reopening of the case. Toward the end of the first visit to Russia Palmer received the formal answer of the Metropolitan of Moscow, Philaret. "It was to this effect;—that he who would receive the communion from a diocesan bishop, must submit absolutely and without restriction to all the doctrine, discipline, and ritual of the Orthodox (Eastern) Church. But to make union or reconciliation, with any concession or

---

of the Russian Church, and at one time Under-Procurator of the Most Holy Governing Synod; a layman.

allowance, however small, is beyond the power of a diocesan bishop, and can be done only by Synods." [28]

But in 1842, on the occasion of his second visit, Palmer presented a petition to the Synod asking that he might be admitted to its communion without having to make abjuration as if a heretic, or else that they should inform him wherein he was considered a heretic. The Synod's answer, sent after a delay of four months, declared that "Seeing that the British Church has never yet, by any Synodal act, expressed her purpose of restoring that union with our orthodox Catholic Church which she has lost, by disavowing all dogmas contrary to our orthodox Confession; and seeing that the present Letters of a single Bishop with the Petition of a single Deacon, as expressing no more than the opinions of individuals, are in nowise matter for Synodal deliberation, the H. Synod for these reasons cannot admit the petitioner . . . to the Communion of our Church otherwise than by the Rite prescribed for converts from heterodoxy." [29]

On receipt of this answer Palmer, not content to let the matter drop, sent a second pe-

[28] *Notes of a Visit,* p. 415.

[29] *Appeal,* p. 136 (dated Dec. 21, 1842, Old Style; Jan. 2, 1843, New Style).

tion to the Synod, seeking to know when the British Church lost the right of communion, and asking that a confessor be appointed to examine him as to the correctness of his beliefs.[80] The Synod appointed the Archpriest Koutnevich, not as confessor, but that he might confer with the petitioner. After protracted discussion, carried on orally and in writing, the decision was that before Palmer could expect to be received into the Russian Church he was to confess that certain "false and heretical propositions, contrary both to the truth and to the doctrine of the Oecumenical Eastern Church, are either expressly contained in the XXXIX Articles, or else may plainly and necessarily be inferred from them." [81] The number of these was reduced to forty-four, which Palmer was prepared to anathematize as "not errors only but real heresies in the strictest sense"; [82] but he would not admit that they were to be found, explicitly or not, in the XXXIX Articles. He told the Archpriest that on the issue so raised he must appeal to the Bishop from whom he came, and to his Church, "as to whether these heresies were in the XXXIX Articles or not." "If they owned and approved that Confession of our Faith which I had made in Russia, I

[80] *Appeal*, p. 144. [81] *Ibid.*, p. 269. [82] *Ibid.*, p. 279.

could not reasonably be blamed for having refused to anathematize a Church which turned out to be orthodox: but that if, on the other hand, they either allowed those heresies which the Russian Synod objected to me, and which I had anathematized, to be the true sense of the XXXIX Articles, *or attempted by an evasive silence to yoke faith and heresy together,* I would return to Russia, and seek to be Reconciled by the prescribed Form from the Scottish Church, as from heresy." [33]

On the historic significance of Palmer's Appeal, Neale's judgment ought not to be overlooked. "It is no good sign," he says, "of English theological attainments, that so very remarkable a book created, comparatively, so little sensation, and that the appeal itself, in the more immediate pressure of passing events, has been nearly forgotten. The secession of its originator to Rome will be, doubtless, an additional cause for ignoring its existence; but it will probably stand, in the future history of our Churches, as the most remarkable event that had occurred since the disruption of the Non-Jurors." [34] And as to the state of the question since the rejection of the Appeal, he

---

[33] *Appeal,* 282.

[34] J. M. Neale, *Life and Times of Bishop Torry,* pp. 224-225.

writes: "Thus the question rested; and may be said to rest still. For I conceive that when the Bishop of St. Andrew's, conjointly with his Synod, had accepted the Appeal, the death of that Prelate did not cause it to fall to the ground. . . . There is nothing, therefore, which renders it impossible that, at some future and more auspicious time, the thread of these negotiations should again be taken up, and some such declaration be made on the subject of passive communion as may be the means of causing the resumption of communications already twice interrupted with the Holy Governing Synod." [35]

Although during the course of this Appeal

---

[35] To follow in detail the history of the Appeal is outside the scope of the present essay, which is primarily concerned with Anglican and Eastern Relations. But some reasons for its failure may be suggested. 1. The Edinburgh Synod (Sep. 7, 1849), which rejected the Appeal, recognized that here were involved "measures affecting the full communion which exists between this Church and the Churches in England, Ireland, and America." Had it accepted the Appeal, the decision would have affected the whole Anglican Communion. It would therefore do nothing to interfere with the fellowship of the several parts of Anglicanism (Neale, *op. cit.*, pp. 260-261).

2. It was impossible at that stage to expect the Scottish Bishops to give a formal judgment on all the 44 Propositions. This was the argument Gladstone used in writing to Palmer, though on the general question he agrees with him. (Dated Palm Sunday, 1849: In "Appeal," Appendix, anonymously—"from a distinguished layman"; also Neale, *op. cit.*, 250.)

3. To these reasons must be added the obvious ones, that the Bishops as a whole did not agree with Palmer, and that the Appeal "had not legitimately arisen." Ref. 35 in text is to Neale, 263.

Palmer had felt that he was approaching more and more the theological position of the Eastern Church, it is probable, as is suggested by the Earl of Selborne, that the secession of Newman to Rome in 1845 was the beginning in him also of a trend in the same direction; and this was aided by the discovery of a liberal, or what he considered "uncatholic," spirit among the educated Russian clergy and laity.[36] But he was to make one more effort to gain admission into the Eastern Church.

2. With the Oecumenical Patriarchate

After the failure of the Appeal in Scotland, Palmer undertook a journey to the Mediterranean. By this time he had lost all confidence in the Church of England,[37] and was prepared to seek admission into the Eastern Church as a convert, on condition only that the validity of his Anglican baptism was conceded and he was not required to submit to rebaptism. But whereas the Russian branch of the Eastern Church did not rebaptize such converts, the Greek had come to insist upon so doing,[38] thus departing from the original practice. While at Constantinople, therefore, he left with the Pa-

[36] *Selborne Memorials,* Part I, Vol. I, 420.

[37] *Ibid.,* Chapter XXXVIII (*Re* 1851-1852).

[38] For discussion of this difference see F. Gavin, *Some Aspects of Orthodox Greek Thought,* 1923, pp. 263-267.

triarch a "Memorial or question," intimating that on his return in a few weeks he would call for a reply. The purport of this Memorial was to express his complete agreement with the doctrine of the Orthodox Church, and his desire to be received as a convert, but without rebaptism. He undertook to point out that in this vital matter there was a discrepancy in the practice of the Greek and Russian Churches. As a compromise agreeable to himself he suggested receiving *conditional* rebaptism by the Greeks.

Such endeavour on the part of an outsider to force the Churches of the East into uniformity in this respect signally failed. Palmer's own account of this last incident is given in a letter to be found in the *Selborne Memorials*:[89]

"On Sunday morning, 5th October, I was received by the Patriarch of Constantinople, in a lesser Synod; in which, after the usual coffee and pipes, and some informal conversation, and after transacting some other business, he adverted to my question concerning Baptism: saying to the bishops and ecclesiastics who were sitting with him, and who were ten in number, that there was this question which needed to be answered. And then, addressing himself to me, he continued: 'There is no need of any long answer; we have, and know, but One Baptism. If the Russians do otherwise, we know it not nor recognize it. We admit only One

[89] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, 121-122.

Baptism, and that without any addition, subtraction, or alteration' (alluding under this word, no doubt, to my question about conditionality) 'whatever.' I observed that I understood, then, that it was unnecessary for me to wait longer at Constantinople, or to expect any further answer? And, on the Patriarch replying that I understood rightly—that there was no need of any further answer—I thanked him for the answer so given, and took my leave. I should have mentioned that, after giving me the answer, as above, the Patriarch turned himself to the right and the left, to the Bishops seated nearest him on the divan, and said: 'That is the answer, is it not?' And they assented, either verbally, or by bowing towards him in return. Thus, then, so far as I personally am concerned, I have fully stated the difficulty to the authorities of the Greek Church, and have received my answer."

There was now nothing left for Palmer to do but to join the Roman Church, which he did in 1855, though even then he continued to lean in some respects to Greek rather than Roman theology.[40]

III. The Causes of Failure.

The causes of the failure of the episode are in the main to be found in the personality of the leading character, in the errors under which he laboured, and in the unwisdom of his meth-

[40] See his profession of faith on joining the Church of Rome, in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, pp. 176 ff; also pages 182-188, which give the relevant part of his letter to the Chief Procurator, Count Alexis Tolstoi.

ods. Regarding Palmer himself, it could not be forgotten that he had come, not in an official, but in a private capacity; whereas a mission of the kind stood in need of the approval and support of the entire Anglican Church. The severance of the Churches was too evident to be ignored. For a religious leader to assume that no such cleavage existed was to lay himself open to a charge of delusion or wilful blindness. Now, division of this kind being admitted, it was not private enterprise that could set it right, but some sort of corporate or Synodical action on the part of both Churches. Palmer did expect Synodical action in Russia regarding his application, but brought nothing corresponding to it from the authorities of the Church of England.

And not only was he acting as a private individual member of his Church, but he did not even represent the general attitude and teaching of that Church. For the Tractarian theories were by no means universally held within Anglicanism at the time. Some were not universal even among those connected with the Tractarian Movement.

The unofficial character of the applicant, and the unrepresentative nature of his views, did not escape the notice of the Eastern Church,

and particularly of the Russian branch of it. It is possible they were also aware of the errors into which he had fallen. Chief of these was his forgetting that the Branch Theory upon which his action was based was comparatively unknown even within the Church of England. Certainly it was meaningless to the Easterns, and unheard of, and was in fact distinctly at variance with the Theory held by them, which was one of exclusiveness.[41]

Again, Palmer had mistaken the peculiar genius of the Church of England. In labouring to secure the exclusion of views other than those of his school, he failed to appreciate those elements of compromise and comprehension which characterize that communion.

Finally, there was tactlessness in his methods. So engrossed was he in his own point of view that he neglected to take account of considerations of expediency. The persecution of the Princess Galitzin, in which he showed himself more Russian than the Russians, was not calculated to commend him personally even to Russian ecclesiastics, but rather tended to leave the impression that he was a fanatic. Moreover, the period in which he chose to undertake his mission was one of political strain and of

[41] *Cp.* Khomiakoff's Essay on the Church, given in Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, 222 ff.

suspicion regarding Russia. And, though mistaken, there was an opinion, easily accounted for, that he was but an agent of the British Government, engaged in promoting discord between Russia and other powers.[42]

Thus was brought to an end a sincere but eccentric and misguided attempt to bring the Anglican and Eastern Churches together. It had been prompted by devotion to a peculiar Theory rather than by love for Eastern Christendom, and it ignored the facts of actual division. But reconciliation of bodies of people is brought about, not by sporadic efforts of well-meaning individuals, but by concerted action. This comes when, as a result of deliberate and growing appreciation of the other party, the impulse of a new and ardent affection proves strong enough to transcend petty considerations, and to overcome hindrances, otherwise insuperable, in the way of Reunion.

[42] Selborne, *op. cit.*, Part I, Vol. II, 122 note (*re* Palmer's rebuff at Constantinople): "The following quotation from 'A Diplomatic Study of the Crimean War' (material said to be collected 1863; printed in Russia 1874; English Transation 1882) is worth giving, unutterable as it is: 'It was asserted that Sir S. Canning made active endeavours with the Patriarch of Constantinople to procure from him a declaration of heresy against the Russian Church. An English agent named Palmer, well versed in religious matters, had been sent to study the divergence existing in the dogmas, and to show that the Russian Church had departed from the lap of Orthodoxy. Such a declaration would have had an immense moral effect, as much in the East as in Europe, and even in Russia many dissidents. The Patriarch seems to have refused with firmness.'"

Chapter VI.

CONCLUSION

Between the reticence of the Early Tractarians in the matter of approaches to the Eastern Church, and the leadership of their successors in the same cause, there is a sharp contrast. The present dignified confidence of the English Church in making overtures to other sections of the Christian world was lacking in the Tractarians, whose attitude was rather apologetic. Anglo-Catholicism then had scarcely found itself. It had not reached the stage when, forgetful of itself, it could proceed to meet others as in every respect their equal. But soon after the first years of the Oxford Movement a change is seen. The Sub-Tractarian period witnessed a remarkable outburst of activity in this respect, not the least incidents in which were the labours and writings of John Mason Neale, and the visit to England in 1870 of Archbishop Lycurgus of Syra. It is well to notice the reasons, both for the inadequacy of

early efforts and for the extensive activities after 1845.

The general religious decline during that period, and the summons to undertake with urgency the promotion of a revival of religion in England, will partly explain why the leaders of the Oxford Movement indulged little in overtures to other communions. But there were other causes at work as well. The fact is, the chief concern of these men was to establish the Anglican claim of equality with the rest of Catholic Christendom. Though not avowedly so, this was to all intents and purposes felt to be the necessary preliminary to any Reunion. Hence, the formulation of a definite theory of the Church, which would at the same time justify the Church of England, seemed imperative, and to it their energies were directed.

1. Retarding Influences

But they did so the more, because they were as yet somewhat uncertain of their own position, and of their interpretation of the English Church. For those were years of theological unrest. There was theological development indeed, but not without attendant discomfort. Newman's experience, though extreme in some ways, was typical. They were eager to

feel confident, yet were at the same time fearful regarding the English Church of their dreams.

A further retarding cause, operating in this interval of Tractarian transition from vagueness to consistency and confidence, was the Roman attack on their position, and the consequent demand for their utmost endeavours in repelling the enemy. That was no time for indulging in the pleasant exchange of courtesies with Churches far away. The Roman authorities had prepared an elaborate plan of campaign. Wiseman had hurried from Rome to England, and had started the *Dublin Review* with a purpose. To the Protestant section within the Established Church, the Papal mode of attack would naturally be of little consequence, but to the men of the Oxford Movement it was otherwise. And Wiseman proceeded so to deal with their peculiar arguments as to undermine the faith of many in the Church of England.

But this very difficulty, which at first was a hindrance, constituted also a foremost cause of the later overtures to the Eastern Church. The undisguised enmity of the Roman Church toward the Anglican led the Tractarians to look for allies elsewhere. But it did not do so,

fully, until the catastrophe of 1845 convinced them of the hopelessness of expecting any sympathy from Rome. Once this was clearly understood by them, the Eastward Movement was inevitable, and it would be accelerated by the new Theory of the Church, which postulated the Eastern Church as one of the constituents of Catholic Christendom.

2. Effects of "1845"

Dean Church considers the secession of Newman, accompanied as it was by that of other leading men, a catastrophe. Still, it was not without good results, and one of these was the ending of the period of suspense. Events had moved alarmingly during those twelve years. For long it was not clear what hold the Church of England had on the leaders of the movement. It was known that there was a decided Romeward drift. Men's hearts were failing them for fear. Newman had been given up, and the last act of the drama was daily expected. The silence at Littlemore had been ominous, and it was a relief to have the strain of suspense at an end.

And it was well to lose the wavering element. The time had now come when the Romanizing section had to make its choice. Honest men, who believed they saw in Rome the

true Church, resigned their positions and went over. Men equally honest in their confidence in the Church of England, remained; and these included the leaders, Pusey, Keble, and Marriott among them. These were now free to proceed to elaborate their defence of the Church of England, without having to be all the while contending against that critical element in their ranks which had been ever ready to respond to the fascination of the Roman system. Thus the Crisis proved the beginning of restored confidence. The loyalty of the leaders had its effect. Their "unshrinking attitude was a new point of departure for those who believed in the Catholic foundations of the English Church." [1] For that Church had been unfairly dealt with. The reproaches and lamentations of Ward and his group regarding the futility and defects of the Church of England were felt to be grossly untrue, as the crisis forced men to examine anew the *facts* of the English Church, instead of being swayed by preconceived theories. And when facts were examined, it was found that the three centuries of the Church of England, as Reformed, were not inglorious, and had not been sterile. Apostolic signs had been abundant: through her instrumentality the blind

[1] Church, *Oxford Movement,* Ch. XIX, 1897 ed., p. 197.

had received their sight, the unclean had been cleansed, and the poor had had the gospel preached to them. The marks, therefore, of a true Church were not wanting. Here was a conviction based on facts, not on the subtleties of dialectic. "The feeling which had often stirred, even when things looked at the worst, that Mr. Newman had dealt unequally and hardly with the English Church, returned with gathered strength. The English Church was, after all, as well worth living in and fighting for as any other; it was not only in England that light and dark, in teaching and in life, were largely intermingled, and the mixture had to be largely allowed for. . . . In those days of stress and sorrow were laid the beginnings of a school whose main purpose was to see things as they are." [2]

Restored confidence in the Church of England, a Church inheriting the Catholic past but also Reformed and made more spiritual, brought with it a deeper sense of a great mission. It was the mission suggested in part in the teachings of Alexander Knox, who had urged that the course providentially marked out for the Church of England was toward the Eastern Church, and toward bringing about a

[2] Church, *Oxford Movement,* Ch. XIX, 1897 ed., pp. 401-402.

Reformation in other communions. This definite trend on the part of a confident Anglicanism was foreshadowed even in the events of the twelve years under consideration. The survey in the preceding chapters shows the tendencies of the Tractarians according to their theological outlook. Generally speaking—Palmer of Magdalen being the great exception—it is found that the men who had a Romeward inclination and were uncertain as to the Church of England, were the persons least disposed to take into account the Eastern Church, or manifest enthusiasm in bringing about a better understanding therewith; whereas the men who were convinced of the Catholicity and of the distinctive mission of the Reformed Church of England were the persons eager to seek and to cultivate such friendly relations. To this significant alignment Deacon Palmer drew attention, on the eve of his joining the Church of Rome. Writing to Khomiakoff in 1853, he says: "The disposition to think and speak favourably of the Eastern Church, and to dream of some union with it, rather than with Rome, exists only in those who are yet tenacious adherents of the Anglican Church, but invariably diminishes and disappears in proportion as they come to doubt the Anglican Church, and to contem-

plate the necessity of abandoning her for some other 'communion'—or rather, I should say, of submitting to the Roman—for the thought of abandoning the Anglican Church and submitting to Easternism as being the true Catholicism or Universality never so much as crosses their mind." [3]

3. Net Results of the Early Tractarian Period

These years witnessed the growing appreciation of points in common between the two Churches. The first of these was the agreement in doctrine, the second was the similarity in worship. On the former, something has been said in the preceding pages. A further instance of a deliberate approximation to the doctrine of the East is the *Harmony of Anglican and Eastern Doctrine*,[4] by Palmer of Magdalen, who thus expresses himself on the general subject: "I am perfectly sure of the existence in the Anglican Church of an element of faith and doctrine not only *like*, but *identical* with, the faith and doctrine of the Eastern Church." [5] This reflects the

[3] In Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 146.

[4] *Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of the East*, 1846.

[5] In Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 24. The rest of the passage is: "so that though union with the present Anglican Church, which is made up of conflicting and undeveloped tendencies, partly orthodox and partly heretical, is out of the question, union with the orthodox element of the Anglican Church, whenever it shall have asserted its own exclusive ascendency, and expelled its

views of many Tractarians, and their aim, by emphasizing identity of faith, to prepare the way for dogmatic union.

The appearance of the study of liturgics about this time tended to further the same end. Though the use of a liturgy was not peculiar to "Catholicism," having sometimes been enjoined by Protestant Reformed Churches, in the English Church it was an indispensable part of worship. There was such a thing as "the English Rite." The first important work on Anglican liturgics was the *Origines Liturgicae* by William Palmer of Worcester College, which sought to enquire into the origins of the Prayer Book.[6] Then again, the Ritualist Movement, which should not be confused with the Oxford Movement, was none the less its natural outcome: the veneration of the historic in general, and of everything connected with antiquity, produced a preference for stateliness in worship, and a dissatisfaction where, or insofar as, the traditional Catholic ritual was absent or was impaired.

---

heretical antagonist, will be perfectly natural and easy, and scarcely need any negotiation or conference, except for merely subordinate matters of discipline and ritual."

[6] First ed., 1832; 4th ed., 1845. In the study of the origins of the Prayer Book, Palmer had been anticipated by Lloyd (Bishop of Oxford, 1827-1829, and Regius Professor of Divinity), whose notes were made use of in the *Origines Liturgicae*. See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

Now, where the ritual ideal existed it was bound to be attracted by the magnificence of the Oriental cultus. And in like manner the new devotion to the Prayer Book, accompanied by the investigation of liturgical origins, would issue in increased appreciation of the Greek heritage in Anglican worship. To the same end would contribute the sympathetic examination of other rites, one result of which was the proposal in 1840 to reprint, not only the Sarum Breviary, but also the Eastern Liturgies.[7]

It may still be thought that this period does not show the advance one would have expected toward Reunion; that progress was insignificant and slow. But the achievement of Reunion is not the work of a few years. It is not something that can be hurried. It is the result largely of the creation of right sentiment, and this quieter work cannot always be appraised aright by what is visible to the superficial observer. Judged from the proper standpoint, the work of the Tractarians for Reunion with the Eastern Church was considerable. Though certain difficulties, namely those due to the retention of the *Filioque* and to the fact of the "Reformed" character of the Church of England, proved insurmountable, much was done to prepare for

[7] *Life of Pusey*, II, 148.

the next, or "Sub-Tractarian" stage. Then when in 1870 the Vatican decrees were promulgated, a Crisis corresponding to that of 1845 was brought about in Tractarian ranks. The Vatican Council effectually checked any general movement toward the Roman Church. It showed the Anglo-Catholics—what they have recognized and acted upon since—that for them the proper and more immediate path of Reunion was in the direction, not of Rome, but of Constantinople.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

consisting, (I) of the main Tractarian and related sources referred to in the text or in footnotes; (II) of some works of a later date which have been of special value in the study of this subject.

I.

Beaven, James, *On Intercourse between the Church of England and the Churches of the East; and on the Ecclesiastical Condition of the English Abroad.* London, 1840.

British Critic, *The,* London 1793-1843 (the volumes relating to the Tractarian period).

British Magazine *and Monthly Register of Religious and Ecclesiastical Information.* London, 1832-1849.

Froude, Richard Hurrell, *Remains.* London, 1838-1839.

(Golightly, C. P.), *Correspondence Illustrative of the Actual State of Oxford, with Reference to Tractarianism, and the Attempts of Mr. Newman and His Party to Unprotestantize the National Church.* Oxford, 1842.

HARRISON, BENJAMIN, *Charge to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Maidstone,* May, 1848. London, 1848.

HOPE-SCOTT, JAMES R., *The Bishopric of the United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem.* Considered in a letter to a friend, by James R. Hope, D.C.L. London, 1841. (2d Ed., Revised, with postscript. London, 1841).

HOOK, WALTER FARQUHAR, *Reasons for Contributing Funds Towards the Support of an English Bishop at Jerusalem.* London, 1842.

KNOX, ALEXANDER, *Thirty Years of Correspondence Between John Jebb . . . Bishop of Limerick . . . and Alexander Knox, Esq.,* M.R.I.A. Edited by the Rev. Charles Foster, B.D. London, 1834.

KNOX, ALEXANDER, *Remains.* 4 vols. London, 1834-1837.

KEBLE, JOHN, *Primitive Tradition Recognized in Holy Scripture.* London, 1836.

KEBLE, JOHN, *Sermons Academical and Occasional.* Oxford, 1847.

KEBLE, JOHN, *Letters of Spiritual Counsel and Guidance.* Edited by R. F. Wilson. Oxford, 1870.

KEBLE, JOHN, *Sermons for the Christian Year.* 11 vols. Oxford, 1875-1880.

KEBLE, JOHN, *Studia Sacra. Commentaries on the Introductory Verses of St. John's Gospel, and on a*

Portion of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans; with Other Theological Papers. Oxford, 1877.

MARRIOTT, CHARLES, *A Lecture Delivered at the Diocesan College, Chichester.* Chichester, 1840.

MARRIOTT, CHARLES, *The Church's Instruments for the Work of the Holy Spirit.* Oxford, 1841.

MARRIOTT, CHARLES, *Five Sermons on the Principles of Faith and Church Authority.* Littlemore, 1850.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, *Parochial and Plain Sermons.* London, 1836.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, *The Prophetical Office of the Church, Viewed Relatively to Romanism and Popular Protestantism.* London, 1837.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, *The Catholicity of the Anglican Church* (in *The British Critic,* January, 1840).

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, *A Letter Addressed to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on His Recent Eirenicon.* 3d Ed., London, 1866.

OAKELEY, FREDERICK, *Sermons Preached Chiefly in the Chapel Royal at Whitehall.* London, 1839.

OAKELEY, FREDERICK, *Explanation of a Passage in an Article on Certain Works of Bishop Jewel, published in The British Critic for July 1841.* By the Writer of the Article. London, 1842.

OAKELEY, FREDERICK, *Historical Notes on the Trac-*

tarian Movement (A. D., 1833-1845). London, 1865.

PALMER, WILLIAM, of Magdalen College. *Aids to Reflection on the Seemingly Double Character of the Established Church.* Oxford, 1841.

PALMER, WILLIAM, *A Letter to the Rev. C. P. Golightly.* Oxford, 1841.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Magd.), *A Harmony of Anglican Doctrine with the Doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Churches of the East.* (The name of the author is not given on title page. Written in collaboration with R. W. Blackmore). Aberdeen, 1846.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Magd.), *An Appeal to the Scottish Bishops and Clergy, and Generally to the Church of Their Communion.* (The author's name is not given anywhere. In the *Appeal* he refers to himself as "N. N., Deacon"). Edinburgh, 1849.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Magd.), *Dissertations on Subjects Relating to the "Orthodox" or "Eastern Catholic" Communion.* London, 1853.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Magd.), *Notes of a Visit to the Russian Church in the Years 1840, 1841.* Selected and arranged by Cardinal Newman. London, 1882.

PALMER, WILLIAM, of Worcester College. *The Apostolical Jurisdiction and Succession of the Episcopacy in the British Churches, Vindicated Against the Objections of Dr. Wiseman, in the Dublin Review.* London, 1840.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *A Compendious Ecclesiastical History from the Earliest Period to the Present Time.* London, 1840. Also several later editions.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *Letters to N. Wiseman, D.D., on the Errors of Romanism.* Oxford, 1842.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *An Examination of the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp's Reasons for His Secession from the Church.* Oxford, 1842.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *A Supplement to an Examination of Mr. Sibthorp's Pamphlet, Comprising Observations on His "Further Answer," etc.* Oxford, 1842.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *A Treatise on the Church of Christ.* 3d Ed. (First ed., 1838). London, 1842.

PALMER, WILLIAM (Worc.), *A Narrative of Events, Connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times, with Reflections on Existing Tendencies to Romanism and on the Present Duties and Prospects of Members of the Church.* Oxford, 1843. (Reissued, London, 1883, with an introduction, and a supplement extending to that year).

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *A Christian Peace-Offering; Being an Endeavour to Abate the Asperities of the Controversy Between the Roman and English Catholic Churches.* London, 1829.

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *The Churchman's Manual; or Questions and Answers on The*

Church; on Protestant and Romish Dissenters; and Socinians. Oxford, 1834. (Issued anonymously.)

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *Historical Notices Concerning Some of the Peculiar Tenets of the Church of Rome.* 1836.

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *Observations on a Pamphlet Entitled "Consensus Omnium."* London, 1838.

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *A Vindication of the Proceedings Relative to the Mission of Bishop Alexander to Jerusalem.* London, 1843.

PERCEVAL, ARTHUR PHILIP, *Origines Hibernicae, or, A Brief Inquiry into the Source of Irish Christianity.* Dublin, 1849.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *Letter to the Right Rev. Father in God, Richard Lord Bishop of Oxford, on the Tendency to Romanism Imputed to the Doctrines Held of Old, as Now, in the English Church.* Oxford, 1839.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *The Articles Treated on in Tract XC Reconsidered, and Their Interpretation Vindicated, in a Letter to the Rev. R. W. Jelf, D.D.* Oxford, 1841.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, on Some Circumstances Connected with the Present Crisis in the English Church.* 2d Ed. Oxford, 1842.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *Tract XC. On Certain Passages in the XXXIX Articles, by the Rev. J. H.*

Newman, B.D. With a Historical Preface by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., and "Catholic Subscription to the XXXIX Articles Considered in Reference to Tract XC," by the Rev. John Keble, M.A., 1841. Oxford, 1865. (A revised edition of the above preface by Pusey appeared, Oxford, 1866).

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *On the Clause "And the Son" in Regard to the Eastern Church and the Bonn Conference. A Letter to . . . Rev. H. P. Liddon.* Oxford, 1876.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, *Eirenicon. Parts I., II., III.* Oxford, 1865, 1869, 1870.

(RENOUF, PETER LE PAGE) *The Character of the Rev. W. Palmer, M.A., of Worcester College, as a Controversialist, Particularly with Reference to His Charge Against the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman of Quoting as Genuine Works of the Fathers, Spurious and Heretical Productions.* By a Late Member of the University. 1843. (Published anonymously, but probably by this author).

ROSE, HUGH JAMES, *The State of Protestantism in Germany Described; Being the Substance of Four Discourses Preached Before the University of Cambridge in 1825.* Second edition, enlarged, with an appendix. London, 1829.

TOMLINSON, GEORGE, *Report of a Journey to the Levant, Addressed to His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, President of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.* n.d. (c. 1841).

TRACTS FOR THE TIMES. Nos. I-XC. London, 1833-1840.

WARD, WILLIAM GEORGE, *A Few Words in Support of No. XC of the Tracts for the Times.* Oxford, 1841.

WARD, WILLIAM GEORGE, *A Few More Words in Support of No. XC of the Tracts for the Times.* Oxford, 1841.

WARD, WILLIAM GEORGE, *The Ideal of a Christian Church in Comparison with Existing Practice.* Oxford, 1844.

II.

BIRKBECK, W. J., *Russia and the English Church, During the Last Fifty Years.* London, 1895.

CHURCH, R. W., *The Oxford Movement. Twelve Years 1833-1845.* London, 1897.

COLERIDGE, SIR J. T., *A Memoir of the Rev. John Keble, M.A., Late Vicar of Hursley.* 3d Ed. Oxford and London, 1870.

DOUGLAS, J. A., *The Relations of the Anglican Churches with the Eastern Orthodox,* London, 1921.

GAVIN, FRANK, *Some Aspects of Contemporary Greek Orthodox Thought,* Milwaukee, 1923.

HECHLER, W. H., *The Jerusalem Bishopric.* London, 1883. (Especially the Appendix of same, containing all the official documents.)

HOPE-SCOTT, JAMES R., *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott.* Edited by Robert Ornsby. 2 vols. London, 1884.

Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman During his Life in the English Church. Edited by Anne Mozley, New Edition, 1898, 2 Vols.

Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and Others, 1839-1845. Edited at the Birmingham Oratory, England, 1917.

Selborne Memorials, Family and Personal. 2 vols. (*Re* 1766-1865.) London, 1896.

LIDDON, H. P., *Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey.* 4 vols. London, 1893. (Vols. 1 and 2 particularly.)

WILLIAMS, GEORGE, *The Orthodox Church of the East in the Eighteenth Century.* Being the Correspondence between the Eastern Patriarchs and the Non-Juring Bishops. London, 1868.

INDEX

Alexander, Bishop M.S. of Jerusalem, 110f.
Andrewes, Bishop Lancelot (1555-1626), 24n, 84.
'Anglo-Catholic,' the Name, 23, 24, 46, 49.
'Anglo-Catholicus,' on the Jerusalem Bishopric, 116f.
'Apologia,' Newman's, 101, 125.
Apostolicity, a Note of the Church, 33-36.
Badger, George P., 143, 144.
Beaven, James, 75, 136f.
Bethlehem, Synod of (1672), 163, 164.
Blomfield, Bishop Charles James, of London, 144, 148, 149.
Bowden, J. W., 80f.
Branch Theory of the Church, 22, 28, 73.
'British Critic,' on the Jerusalem Bishopric, 141n.
Bunsen, Christian C. J., Baron von, 102f, 106, 107, 109.
Canning, Sir Stratford (Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe), 106.
Catholicity, a Note of the Church, 29-33, 43.
'Churchman's Manual,' 64.
Church Missionary Society, 85, 143.
Church of England,
  Apostolical Succession in, 39n.
  Article XXI, 13f.
  Article XXIII, 33n.
  Catholicity, 36ff.
  Continuity, 39.
  Erastianism, 10.
  Reformed Character of, 3, 164.
  Reformation, Relation to the, 10, 40.
  Schism of, Denied, 36, 37, 38, 73.
Creeds, 13.
Dissent, and Dissenters, 61.
Donatism, Charged Against Anglican Church, 74, 128.
'Dublin Review,' 74, 179.
Eastern Church,
  Anglo-Eastern Relations, 142-149.
  Errors Regarding, 76f.
  Exclusiveness, 43.
  Rebaptism of Converts, 171-173.
  Seventh Oecumenical Council, 11, 41.
  Theory of the Church, 41f.

'Eastern Church Association' (founded 1864), 82f.
Ecumenical, etc.: see Oecumenical.
'Filioque' Clause, 87-95, 166.
Frederick William IV, of Prussia, 102, 108.
Froude, Richard Hurrell (1803-1836), on
Rome, 63, 67.
Transubstantiation, 66, 69f.
Gregory VI, Patriarch, Deposition of, 115.
Harrison, Benjamin, 141n.
Hill, John H., Missionary to Greece, 145n.
Holiness, a Note of the Church, 28f.
Hook, Walter Farquhar (1798-1875), 3, 40n, 64n, 129-132.
Hooker, Richard (1553-1600), on Branch Theory, 24, 27n.
Hope-Scott, J. R. (1812-1873), 123.
Howley, Archbishop William (1766-1848), 144, 147, 148.
Icon Worship, 41, 72.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 5, Chapter V.
Keble, John (1792-1866), on
Continuity, 39.
Eastern Church, 81f.
'Filioque' Clause, 90f.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 126.
Tradition, 12.
Transubstantiation, 66.
Unity, 19f.
Khomiakoff, Alexis S., 43, 44, 175n.
Knox, Alexander (1757-1831), 42, 182.
Lambeth Appeal (1920), 25.
Luscombe, Bishop Matthew, 156, 156-7n, 158, 159, 161.
Manning, Henry Edward, 64n.
Mariolatry, 71.
Marriott, Charles (1811-1858), on
Rome, 68.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 14n.
Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt, 103.
'Millet' System in Turkey, 105.
Mouravieff, A. N., 165.
Neale, John Mason, 169f, 177.
Newman, John Henry (1801-1890), on
'Apologia,' 101, 125.
Apostolical Succession, 34f.
Branch Theory, 22f.
Catholicity, 25.
Dissent, 61.
Eastern Church, 77ff.
'Holiness,' Note of, 29.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 101, 124f, 141n.
Oecumenical Councils, 14, 78.
Rome, 63, 68.
Tracts for the Times, 8.
Transubstantiation, 65.
Unity, 17, 18f.

Nicaea II, 787 A. D. (Seventh Oecumenical Council), 41, 95-99.
Nicene Creed, 28, 31.
Notes of the Church, 16.
Oakeley, Frederick (1802-1880), on
Catholicism, 30.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 141n.
Protestantism, 30.
Oecumenical Councils, 13ff, 43.
Infallibility of, 14f.
Nicaea II, 11, 41, 95-99.
Palmer, (Deacon) William, of Magdalen College. Chapter V. Also on
Appeal to Scottish Bishops, 160-162, 162-163n, 169, 170.
Branch Theory, 22f, 60.
Church of England, 38n, 44, 168f, 183, 184.
'Deacon Palmer,' The Designation, 20n.
Doctrine, Anglican and Eastern, 44.
'Filioque' Clause, 91-95.
Galitzin Incident, 155-160.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 106f, 119-123.
Nicaea II, 97n.
Protestantism, 29f, 40, 153.
Re-baptism, Question of, 171-173.
Russian Visit, 80, 154-155, 164.
Palmer, William (1803-1885), of Worcester College, on
Palmer, William—*Continued*
Anglo-Catholicism, 48.
Church of England, 37, 60.
Eastern Church, 82.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 118f.
Letters to Wiseman, 64, 69, 70, 71.
Nicaea II, 97.
Rome, Church of, 64, 70.
Tracts for the Times, 8.
Tradition, 12n.
Unity, Note of, 20.
Perceval, Arthur Philip (1799-1853), 37n. Also, 'Churchman's Manual,' 64.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 132-136.
Rome, Church of, 64, 67.
Philaret, Archbishop of Moscow, 50, 166.
Prussian Church, 104.
Relations with Church of England, 104n.
Pusey, Edward Bouverie (1800-1882), on
Apostolical Succession, 33n.
Church of England, 38n.
Eastern Church, 83-86.
'Filioque' Clause, 87-89.
Jerusalem Bishopric, 126-129, 141n.
Nicaea II, 96f.
Oecumenical Councils, 14.
Rome, Church of, 63f, 64n.
Theory of the Church, 11.
Unity, Note of, 17n.
'Reformed Catholic,' The Name, 23, 48.
Robertson, John J., 145.

Rome, Church of,
Attraction of, 63f.
Controversy with, 62ff, 66ff.
Schismatic in England, 72, 73.
Rose, Hugh James (1795-1838), on
Apostolical Succession, 34.
Protestantism, 30.
Theory of the Church, 11.
Routh, Martin Joseph (1755-1854), 121, 154.
Sacramentalism, 65.
Saint-Worship, 71.
Schism, 73.
Selborne, Roundell Palmer, Earl of, 114, 142f, 151, 152.
Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 143.
Southgate, Horatio, 145, 146.
'Standard' (newspaper), on Jerusalem Bishopric, 115.
'Times' (newspaper), on Jerusalem Bishopric, 114ff.
Tomlinson, George, 145.
Letters Commendatory to, 146-149.
Torry, Bishop Patrick, 107f.
Tractarianism, 9.
Attitude to Church of Rome, 62ff, 66.
Theory of the Church, 11, 15ff.
Tracts for the Times, 8, 33n.
Tract XC, 14, 65, 66.
Tradition, 12.
Transubstantiation, 65f, 69, 70.
Trent, Council of, 65, 67.
Unity, a Note of the Church, 17ff.
Ward, William George (1812-1882), 15, 59, 60. Also on
Oecumenical Councils, 15.
Reformation, The, 60.
Rome, Attitude to, 63.
Tract XC, 65.
Wiseman, Cardinal Nicholas, 39, 74, 179.

PRINTED IN
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY
MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING CO.
MILWAUKEE, WIS.

DATE DUE

United Theological Seminary Library
MAIN BX5098.S51 1930
Shaw, Plato E The early tractarians and
3 0645 0004 0302 8